



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Volume II.*  
*Number 10.*

*December, 1894.*

*Whole  
Number 20.*

# THE SCHOOL REVIEW

## A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

### THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

The Ninth Annual Meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools was held in the Public Latin School, Boston, on Friday and Saturday, Oct. 12th and 13th, 1894.

#### FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

The Association was called to order at 2:40 by the President, Dr. John Tetlow, of Boston.

The Chair was by vote authorized to appoint a Nominating Committee. As subsequently designated, this committee consisted of Professor Charles E. Fay, Mr. Arthur L. Goodrich, President William F. Warren, Dr. William T. Peck and Professor William Carey Poland.

The Association proceeded at once to the discussion announced on the programme.

**THE CHAIR:** The subject which we have met to discuss this afternoon is one that is of great interest to the so-called English high schools of New England. It is of especial interest to the high schools of Boston. There are several such high schools, many of which have a four-years' course of study. This four-years' course is out of relation to the requirements of the colleges. Although the course of study is a very practical one, yet about one-third of the work done does not count, so far as admission to college is concerned. If our deliberations this afternoon should issue in a practical recommendation to the higher institutions, great good, it seems to me, would result. For example, if, as the ultimate issue of our deliberations this afternoon, the colleges and

scientific schools should declare themselves ready to accept the satisfactory completion of any one of the four programmes offered by the Committee of Ten as an adequate preparation for collegiate study, I should personally feel strongly inclined to invite a Conference of the Boston High School Masters with a view to making application to the school authorities for a modification of the high school course of study. The form which the subject assigned for discussion takes is:—"How may closer articulation between the secondary schools and higher institutions be secured?"

What is meant by that question is indicated on the programme by an extract from the Report of the Committee of Ten, which reads as follows:—"The Committee are of the opinion that the satisfactory completion of any one of the four-years' courses of study embodied in the foregoing programmes (see pp. 46-47 of the report) should admit to corresponding courses in colleges and scientific schools. They believe that this closer articulation between the secondary schools and the higher institutions would be advantageous alike for the schools, the colleges, and the country."

The discussion will be opened by a paper from Dr. Ray Greene Huling, Head Master of the Cambridge English High School.

DR. HULING: Is close articulation between the secondary schools and the higher institutions desirable? In New England its desirability might be assumed without fear of contradiction. Many among us have been looking for it and pleading for it for more than a decade. Out of a desire for it there sprang in 1885 this very association of teachers in the schools and teachers in the colleges, and that desire has seemed to grow stronger and more general with each succeeding year. To lovers of order and system, the picture of an unbroken ladder open to the climbing of every capable youth, and leading from the kindergarten to the university, has been a most attractive one. Toward this ideal much progress has already been made along the earlier stages of education, and at the other extreme. For instance, in both public and private systems the passage from the kindergarten to the primary school, and thence to the grammar school, has long been made easy. The joint next above, where elementary and secondary education meet, was later in receiving adequate attention; but now almost everywhere the connection is well established.

So, too, the connection between college and university work is exceedingly close; in some institutions, indeed, the line of separation seems almost obliterated. The lack of smooth joining, therefore, is most conspicuous at the point of juncture between the secondary school on the one hand and the college or scientific school on the other. Even here there is some degree of articulation. The private and endowed preparatory schools and the public Latin schools have few grievances in these days, and those few are yielding to the gentle pressure of the enlightened interest in each other's difficulties which is so manifest in the conferences between teachers and professors in our time. The break in connection is chiefly between the higher institutions and the high schools.

The reason for failure of adjustment at this point becomes clear on consideration. From the earliest organization of the colleges their requirements have been met by private instructors or by schools organized particularly to meet those requirements,—the ancient grammar schools, the academies, and more recently the private preparatory schools and the public Latin schools. The high school represents quite another educational idea. It is practically the systematic expansion through a four-years' secondary course of the modern studies mapped out for the elementary schools. It represents the best thought of the American people, through elected representatives, concerning the preparation of youth for life. Within a generation it has grown into marvellous favor, and has greatly increased its efficiency. It now conducts the education of more than half the youth of our country who are receiving secondary education at all. From these considerations the high school plainly has great inertia. It could not be conformed to the older type of preparatory school, if the colleges were disposed to make the effort.

But the college is not so disposed. During these later years this institution also has passed through important changes. Its curriculum has been amazingly broadened and extended. I sometimes take out the little pamphlet which first showed me a college course in 1865, and compare it with the somewhat portly catalogue of the same institution to-day. Now for the first time it is feasible to co-ordinate the colleges and the high schools, because now it is possible for the high school to appeal to every variety of

aptitude and talent, and yet find its capable pupil prepared at graduation to pursue with profit some important courses in some higher institution.

This I take to be the real meaning of the oft quoted passage in the Report of the Committee of Ten respecting "the theory that all the subjects are to be considered equivalent in educational rank for the purposes of admission to college."\* Not that all subjects have equivalent educational values; that, as President Eliot has pointed out, cannot be asserted or denied so as to produce conviction until some one has established a standard of educational value. But if all subjects of secondary education, when vigorously followed for three or four years, do open the way for the successful pursuit of substantial courses in higher education, as few will now deny, why are not all subjects of equivalent rank for the purposes of admission to college? Every capable entering student has, as a consequence of his secondary work, both positive aspects of efficiency and also serious limitations; the difference between them may safely be neglected *for purposes of admission*.

Here, then, where the high school and the college meet, is the place for a closer articulation, if progress along the educational highway is to be steady and orderly from the beginning to the end. So far as I know, no educational thinker is on record as opposing close articulation in itself. If it is opposed at all, the opposition is directed against certain methods of securing the adjustment, or certain forms of connection, or else proceeds from considerations of economy. It is very possible, indeed, that the process of connecting the high school with the college may involve too large a sacrifice in one way or another to warrant such procedure. Nor, when I speak of sacrifice, do I refer to money alone. The American people will not for long withhold whatever money is needed to secure the best in education. But there are some things more precious than money. A Western teacher,† at the recent meeting of the National Educational Association, well illustrated the fears of some concerning this closer articulation. He says: "Two high school parties have now appeared, the one

---

\* Page 53.

† Mr. J. Remsen Bishop, of Cincinnati. See N. E. Journal of Education, August 16, 1894.

advocating the continuance of the American system of free development; the other, the trans-oceanic party, contending for a complete co-ordination of the high school and the college. The party of co-ordination with the college claims the high school as properly belonging to the class of schools called in America preparatory schools. This party would exclude, except as incidental subjects, the studies not traditionally required, or likely soon to be required, as a basis for college work. The party of free development, on the other hand, claim that the best equipment for life is the legitimate aim of the high school, and that preparation for college should be confined to a separate and, if possible, distinct department." Yet the gentleman elsewhere says of this party of free development: "They look forward to a time when the colleges will accept all graduates of good high schools, as indeed some colleges do now." The Report of the Committee of Ten, nevertheless, he deems an aggressive effort of the trans-oceanic party; and announces himself, on the other hand, as adhering to the party of free development.

It is plain that this speaker, and others like him, really desire a close articulation, as do those whom they antagonize; but they do not desire it at the sacrifice of the element of free development, which has been so marked a characteristic of the high school as an institution.

The same distrust of close articulation of a certain type appears in these more recent words: "A perpetual throttle upon this wholesome freedom of development is the existence of our requirements for admission to college. Though these requirements have been liberalized in recent years, they still operate as a constricting and prescriptive influence. The college catalogue speaks with an authority wholly factitious, and lays upon secondary teachers a pressure that is artificial and external. Secondary teaching has its own ideals, wholly aloof from the pride of passing examinations. It has its inherent limitations, its own urgent problems. It needs no moulding from alien hands, no goading and nagging by spectators. The first condition of success in American education is freedom,—freedom to speculate, to experiment, to choose, to reject. No thinker, or committee of thinkers, can prescribe its aims, methods, or proportions. In the long run the American public is sure to have its way; and as this pub-

lic wants a great many things, its way is sure to be the way of infinite diversity and variety. The one unthinkable thing in our education is uniformity in schools and courses."\*

These are expressions of current thought by secondary teachers, and, so far as they demand the allowing of free development in the high school and distinct recognition of secondary education as an entity, they are representative opinions. From them we are led to observe that articulation so close as to make our high schools simply college fitting schools of the type illustrated by the Latin schools, is not highly desirable. Not that the Latin schools do not illustrate a good type of secondary institution, for they certainly do. But the interests of education demand other good types, also, and, in general, they require a broader and more diversified range of preparation for higher study. Such a preparation the high schools offer in their courses, but do not often prosecute with so much efficiency as the Latin schools secure in their narrower range. The close articulation which is desirable, then, involves the opening of more ways than one or two into higher institutions. The Committee of Ten in their Table IV present four courses, the satisfactory completion of which should admit to corresponding courses in colleges and scientific schools. Elsewhere they show a disposition to go even further, thus: "A college might say,—We will accept for admission any groups of studies taken from the secondary school programme, provided that the sum of the studies in each of the four years amounts to sixteen, or eighteen, or twenty periods a week,—as may be thought best,—and provided, further, that in each year at least four of the subjects presented shall have been pursued three periods a week, and that at least three of the subjects shall have been pursued three years or more."† Somewhat earlier, on the same page, the Committee has given expression to an ideal even less restricted, in these words: "It is obviously desirable that the colleges and scientific schools should be accessible to all boys or girls who have completed creditably the secondary school course. . . . In order that any successful graduate of a good secondary school course should be free to present himself at the gates of the college or the scientific school of his choice, it is

---

\* Dr. Samuel Thurber in the *SCHOOL REVIEW* for October, 1894.

† Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, p. 52.

necessary that the colleges and scientific schools of the country should accept for admission to appropriate courses of their instruction the attainments of any youth who has passed creditably through a good secondary school course, no matter to what group of subjects he may have mainly devoted himself in the secondary schools." This suggestion was subsequently set aside by the Committee, for reasons which they give, in favor of the programmes of Table IV. I find myself, however, preferring it even to those excellent programmes, as a basis for the proposed adjustment.

What, then, I wish to present as an ideal of close articulation is, "that the satisfactory completion of any good four-years' course of study in a secondary school should admit to corresponding courses in colleges,"\* scientific schools, and other higher institutions. Such articulation, I believe, "would be advantageous alike for the schools, the colleges, and the country."†

How may this closer articulation be secured?

To make a good joint, the carpenter finds it necessary to fashion carefully the ends of both pieces that he would join. By analogy we infer that something must be done by both the schools and the higher institutions before complete adjustment can be secured at the juncture between them.

For one thing, the secondary schools must have, as the Committee properly declare, more substantial courses than they now have in many cases. So far as I am able to discover, no State has better courses in its high schools than Massachusetts, but an examination of some fifty programmes of high schools within this commonwealth one day last spring revealed to me many opportunities for improvement. From an address by the present Secretary of the Board of Education, made in July last,‡ some definite facts can be learned on this point. "Of the two hundred and forty-seven high schools, one hundred and ninety-eight offer courses for four years, and some of them [also] parallel courses for three or five years. Twenty-nine offer courses for three years

---

\* These are the words in which the Committee's general recommendation is stated by President Eliot in the *Educational Review* for February, 1894, p. 109.

† Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, p. 53.

‡ *New England Journal of Education*, July 26, 1894.

only, and [twenty] have courses for two years or less." "One hundred and forty-six . . offer college preparatory courses " which include Greek, but the Secretary deprecates the costliness of this kind of preparatory work. So much as to length of course. As to variety within single schools, " one hundred and three offer at least three parallel courses of study, and some of them four or five, or by a system of electives many more. Eighty-eight offer but two courses, forty-five but one, while eleven deal with high school subjects in so scanty and disconnected a way that they cannot be said to offer courses at all." Further, with respect to the intensity of the work, two hundred and twenty-four are on a basis of about fifteen exercises a week. In twenty-three schools only is the number placed at twenty, and this number generally includes from two to five exercises a week in music, drawing, drill, and the like. The Secretary has not found a single public high school squarely on the Committee's basis of twenty exercises exclusive of the usual miscellaneous studies, although two or three schools are struggling to place themselves there. The Report calls, therefore, for one-third more work than the schools now provide for.

There are other points that might be mentioned, but a single one will suffice, that of continuity in the study of the same subject. I saw this week a graphic representation of the four programmes of Table IV, and just below them, displayed by the same plan, a representation of the three courses of a New England high school, which had for its principal a man of established reputation. In the programmes of Table IV, we know continuity was in some degree sacrificed for considerations deemed more important; history, for instance is not offered continuously through the four years, save in the English programme; but by the side of them the high school course was a thing of shreds and patches. This would be true of many courses in high schools. It might serve a useful purpose for us all on going home to chart our own courses and to compare them with the programmes of Table IV.

Perhaps this is enough to support the impression which I entertain, that the courses of study in many high schools (and presumably in many private schools and academies) need revision and strengthening before we can reasonably ask the colleges to accept our graduates. As a matter of fact, of course, many graduates of

high schools do enter college every year despite the present lack of co-ordination; but many more would move along the same path if conditions were more favorable.

In the foregoing I have used the programmes of Table IV as a standard of comparison. The question will naturally arise whether it is best for our high schools that these should be at once adopted. I think we should look forward to the adoption of these and of other courses of equal severity,—one, for instance providing manual training,—but I am of the opinion that we shall gain most by gradual changes in the directions which they point out, and by modification of them according to local demands. In this way we can more safely manage the transition within the school and carry with us the support of the community without. These programmes are ideals toward which we may strive, not idols which we should worship.

Other points of desirable improvement must be more briefly referred to. We need in many schools more teachers in order that classes may be sufficiently small to secure a good degree of individual teaching. In every school we need better teachers, those who know their subjects well and also have at command the art of teaching; broad-minded teachers, capable of correlating their subjects with the others that are influencing the pupil; teachers of much reading and study, who can impel their pupils by hints drawn from loftier ranges of the subject; teachers, too, whose hearts are still in touch with the joys and cares, the ambitions and the temptations of secondary students. We also need,—those of us who have responsibilities as heads of schools,—a deeper insight into the theory of education, and a willingness to study carefully the problems which the times are forcing upon us. The great, patient public is looking to us for guidance, and ought not to be disappointed. But no such insight or study will excuse us for remissness in the careful management of our schools as they are. Waste of energy and inefficiency must be checked. The teaching force that we have must be disposed to the best advantage, and especially vigilant must we be if the choice of new teachers is entrusted to our judgment.

Our schools, with few exceptions, need also a better material equipment. Laboratories for the physical sciences are common, but in many cases are poorly equipped for accurate work. The

facilities for biological study are still too rare and too meagre. Libraries suited to thorough work in history and literature are too often lacking. Yet all of us can remember when matters were worse, and hence we confidently hope to see them better.

But I need not particularize further. In brief, the American high school has only to make itself a thoroughly good school, and articulation with higher institutions will follow as the golden branch yielded to the grasp of the dutiful Æneas. For myself I have no fear that the present splendid opportunity will be lost.

What, now, have the higher institutions to do as their share in bringing about the adjustment?

First, there will doubtless need to be some modifications of the admission requirements. For instance, the doctrine "that every subject which is taught at all in a secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil as long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease," may work in the high school in either of two ways. It may bring all pupils to the college standard, or it may bring the college pupils to the general standard. In most schools the latter is the more likely, and occasionally, for many considerations, preferable. I am not now referring to the issue of good or poor work, but to the nature and range of study. In English, for instance, the colleges have hitherto seemed to prefer that the secondary schools aim chiefly at composition, with less emphasis on the history of literature and literary criticism. In the general courses of the high schools the emphasis has been reversed. Possibly the new relation will result in improvement in both respects, but if not, the broader preparation should be permitted, and even urged in the admission requirements. In physics it is a question whether preparation in the "forty experiments" is not inferior, as a help to ordinary experience in daily life, to a more diversified scheme, such as prevails in the general courses of excellent high schools. The whole question of college requirements seems likely to come up for discussion from a new point of view, because of the desire for closer articulation. I have no doubt that wisdom will prevail in settling the details of all needed modifications.

A second point of interest in the adjustment is the perennial question of the method of admission, whether by examination, by

diploma of graduation, by certificate of the principal of the secondary school, or by some combination of examinations with diplomas or certificates. This is not the occasion to argue this question fully. It has been discussed too recently and ably in our association for a repetition to be attempted. I will simply say that despite the opposing opinions of abler teachers and wiser administrators than myself, I have the conviction that admission by certificate of the principal is the most desirable plan of passage from the high school to the higher institution. It supplies the deliberate judgment of the person who has the best opportunity, personally and through experienced assistants, of knowing the fitness of the student for higher study. It is more reliable than any test applied by strangers under unfamiliar and sometimes untoward conditions can be. It is better than the diploma of graduation as an indication of power to pursue higher work; because the conditions of graduation are imposed by school boards, while the signature to a certificate of fitness is a personal and professional act not subject to the control of school boards. The right to accept the certificate or to reject it belongs to the college; and the college should exercise its right in the negative whenever a teacher is known to have bestowed his signature unworthily, whether through incompetency, or through a desire to curry favor with parents or employers. The principals can trust the colleges to be just, and the colleges can trust the principals, I believe, to be honest.

Under the certificate system of admission, a difference must be made between the certificate and the diploma. I apprehend that it will always be desirable that pupils shall be graduated from high schools who have so nearly reached the limit of their scholastic development that higher study has no promise of profit for them. Such graduates ought not to be sent to college. Every principal knows how to make the distinction. I know a school in which the standard for promotion from class to class and for graduation is as low as 60 per cent. in each subject. But no student receives a recommendation to the preliminaries in any subject unless the principal has satisfied himself that the student merits 75 per cent. in that subject. There are sometimes weeping and wailing and possibly gnashing of teeth; but the distinction holds, and all the

principals that have followed this plan in that school are yet alive.

But setting aside my own preference, and considering the present practice as likely to continue for some time to come, there are certain modifications of the examination method which, if not exactly necessary to close articulation, are greatly to be desired.

Would it be too much to ask, for instance, that the examiners be thoroughly competent for the purpose? Not only those who set the questions, but those, too, who read and mark the answers, and who thus make or mar the student's fortune. Some odd reports float out upon the air when principals of preparatory schools get into a confidential mood. One tells of a pupil who was reported as having failed in, say, chemistry, and who on the reopening of the case was found actually to have passed the examination with credit. Somebody had been careless. Another tells of a lad whose paper in French was handed in, but was subsequently reported as missing, and whose case was not reopened upon application by the principal. The result in this case was that the boy in disgust gave up going to college, and—entered a law school. Doubtless such cases are exceptions, and are regretted at the colleges as much as at the schools; but they hint at an undesirable lack of competency in the conduct of examinations. Undergraduates hired especially for the purpose, even if they lose no papers, are evidently less to be relied upon than the professors whom they relieve from the distasteful task of grading answers. To pass judgment on the quality of a manuscript statement in an unfamiliar hand requires experience in order that justice may be insured.

The time of the examination becomes important in some schools. The Committee of Ten wisely suggest that uniform dates be established in June and September for the admission examinations of colleges and scientific schools throughout the United States.

From the point of view of the college, it would be an excellent change if some means could be found of reducing the cost of the admission examinations. It would be interesting to know what this bill amounts to in a single year in the New England colleges. I remember hearing it said that two or three years ago one examination in experimental physics held in Cambridge cost no less

than \$500; and this was but a small fraction of the entire admission examination of that year for that one institution. Is there not some value in a suggestion made some nine years ago by Dr. Keep, that the New England colleges unite in constituting an Examinations Board, whose certificates should admit to all colleges contributing to its maintenance. The schools would profit by the uniformity which would result, and also by the fact that none but competent examiners would be chosen for such a purpose.

Among the higher institutions none would receive more benefits from close articulation of the kind suggested than the scientific schools. Their circumstances are somewhat different from those of the colleges. They are new institutions and have the plasticity and vigor of youth. Their character has been determined by a few strong men, working out their problems independently of each other. The result, of necessity, has been diversity of requirement, with considerable laxity of admission in some cases. It has even been whispered that students are permitted to take without recommendation,—and that repeatedly,—certain examinations for which the printed announcement requires the recommendation of the principal. The requirements, also, have usually been lower than those for colleges. I see no reason why they should not be substantially equal, both in quantity and in quality, though there are evident reasons for some differences in subjects. The present seems to be a good opportunity for the schools of science and technology to secure practical uniformity, and, withal, to enforce some appreciable increase in their requirements, by making common cause with the colleges in the proposed adjustment on the basis of the satisfactory completion of any good four-years' course of study in a secondary school. It is possible that this requirement would need narrowing somewhat, inasmuch as the variety of courses is smaller in the scientific schools than in the larger colleges; but the natural development of these new institutions will soon obviate any difficulty that might arise from this source.

With regard to the professional schools, of which we like to think as of the university grade, a word will be enough. Their minimum requirement should not, from any conceivable consideration, be lower than that suggested for the colleges and the

scientific schools; and it is earnestly to be hoped that they will ultimately require for entrance the bachelor's degree.

Briefly to summarize what I would say, it is this. Close articulation between the higher institutions and the scientific schools is desirable from many points of view, but is not desirable unless it provides for free development in both classes of institutions. The basis of such articulation should be that the satisfactory completion of any good four-years' course of study in a secondary school should admit to corresponding courses in higher institutions. The securing of such articulation requires action by both classes of educational institutions. The secondary schools should improve their courses of study, using the programmes of Table IV as ideals, with liberty of modification; they should also improve their teaching and their material equipment to the end that they may become thoroughly good schools. The higher institutions should modify requirements so far as is necessary to enable the schools to treat pupils in the same studies alike, whatever their destination. In the personal opinion of the writer, they should admit on the principal's certificate of fitness. But if that is considered unwise, or if for other reasons examinations are preferred, the examiners should be thoroughly competent, uniform dates should be fixed for the examinations throughout the country, and some plan of co-operation should be devised. The basis for admission to scientific schools and to professional schools should not be lower than that for admission to college.

The general plan here outlined receives favorable consideration in the Report of the Committee of Ten, as has been shown, but is set aside because of the weakness of the courses of secondary schools. The distinct recommendations of that Report are in favor of four definite programmes as the basis of adjustment. I prefer the broader ground which I have stated, believing that it is in accord with the trend and spirit of American education. The adjustment, made in whatever way, however, will be an immense gain. It will cut across the caste idea that still dominates European systems. It will close the only gap in the educational ladder that leads from the cradle to the university, and thence out into refined, intelligent service to humanity. It will add one more contribution to the noble end of making the highest education possible for every capable American child.

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion on this question will now be opened by Professor Ephraim Emerton of Harvard University.

PROFESSOR EMERTON: *Ladies and Gentlemen:* I find I am down on the programme as the one to open the discussion. If it depended upon me I fear there would be very little discussion here to-day. I find myself so heartily in agreement with almost everything that has been said by Mr. Huling, that it is difficult to find points of attachment for actual discussion; but even confirmation of views from a different standpoint may, perhaps, be worth our while, and I should like to say two or three things that the reading of Mr. Huling's paper has suggested to me and to make one or two little criticisms. In the main, however, I commend it most heartily.

In the first place I should like to say that personally I feel grateful that Mr. Huling has not suggested to us a scheme of any sort. I know that the idea of salvation by schemes is one which commends itself very much to many persons. We have quantities of schemes presented to us from day to day, each warranted to produce salvation in its own way, and none are received with more approval than those resting upon the idea of uniformity. There are many persons, as we all know, who almost worship this idea of uniformity. I remember hearing once a suggestion something like this: that if throughout our land, at the same moment of every day, all the millions of children of the same age could only be doing and saying precisely the same thing, an ideal state of American education would have been reached. We should probably be surprised if we knew to how many persons that represents a splendid vision of the future. For myself I can only say that if such an ideal could be realized, it would represent to me an intolerable state of affairs. Uniformity is not in itself a thing to be desired, and the mere fact of uniformity is very likely to lead to dull and mechanical conceptions of all educational work, which are fatal to progress. So I think we ought to be grateful to Mr. Huling that he has not held up to us this idea of uniformity.

In our speculations about the best way of doing things here in America we are apt to be much attracted by the results of European experiment, but it is important for us to remember how different are our conditions from those of Europe. In every European country, as, for instance in Germany, the secondary instruction is regulated upon the principle of general uniformity by a central authority from which there is no appeal. Here such central control is, happily, wanting. The colleges are forced to take what they can get, and are able only within rather narrow limits to say what they will not take; for the later stages of American education also are subject to this same condition of variety. The colleges are in their turn limited by their resources,

and dare not try too radical experiments lest they lose the patronage upon which they depend.

Now those who love uniformity are inclined to think of this variety as something unfortunate or even dangerous. To me, however, it seems to be a peculiarly fortunate condition, one which, if properly developed, may produce far better results than we could expect from any uniform system. It has, to be sure, its difficulties, and it is precisely with these that we are called upon to deal in considering this question of closer articulation between the school and the college.

We are all of us fatally familiar with two phrases which I wish might disappear from our vocabulary. These are "fitting school" and "preparatory school". Those two phrases have done us a great deal of harm, and are doing us all harm to-day. They are unfortunate for both parties. They tend to make the school think of itself as in a sort of servile attitude towards the college, and they beget in the colleges a conception of the schools as their "feeders", which is not a helpful one. This feeling is, perhaps, rather stronger on the side of the school than of the college. The school is all too apt to accept this theory of its function, and to direct all its energies to making its pupils ready to pass the examinations of the college. It believes honestly that it must do so in self-defence, because it fancies that its success as a school is somehow measured by the success of its boys at those examinations. I remember hearing one of our best known principals say with regret that he felt himself called upon first of all to get his boys into college. We had been discussing some question of methods and he said, "yes, I quite agree, but that is not the point; the first thing is to get my boys into college. Every other consideration must give way to that." In short, this gentleman, a teacher of great experience and intelligence, felt that he could not teach his own school as he wished. Now I believe he was mistaken on two points. First, I don't think it was his primary duty to get his boys into college, and I doubt very much whether his public really thought it was so. Secondly, I think that if he had taught them as he wished, according to the best light he had and with the best resources at his command, he not only would have had a better school, but he would have prepared his boys better for college.

I have a great deal of sympathy with what Mr. Huling has said about the weak points of college examinations. It has been my misfortune to serve at different times on the Committee on Admission Examinations at Harvard College, and know therefore from personal experience how exceedingly difficult it is to present questions that are right in all respects. I know also how much more difficult still it is properly to examine the enormous mass of written material that is poured in upon us in the incredibly short

space of time within which—chiefly in the interest of the candidates—it has to be done. If any unsympathetic person should look in upon the Committee on Admissions during those three or four days in the early part of July, when the school teachers are all enjoying their vacation, possibly his feeling on the subject might be very materially changed.

The feeling of the colleges towards the schools in this matter of "fitting", I believe to be in the main a very liberal and open-minded one. Every college man knows that the examinations are only a makeshift. We know well that they are not perfect; they are miles from being perfect. It is simply our way of doing the best we can with the resources at our command. Of course I can speak here only for one college, but I don't think I am running any great risk in saying that the college does not begin to be as particular about the details as the schools think it is or tries to be. So far as I hear any talk about the requirements for admission to Harvard College, it all tends in one direction, namely, that technical requirements are of little account, as compared with general excellence all along the line. It is a matter of comparative indifference whether a boy has learned his Latin in a certain way: the question is, "does he know his Latin?" If he does he will pass; I do not say he will pass with the same credit—credits at entrance examinations are a snare for examiners as well as candidates and I wish they had never been thought of—but he would certainly receive the most lenient consideration.

Even in such a subject as English, where it is required that candidates should have read certain books, every one knows that we ask for these, not because we think they are any more important than a thousand others, but simply in order that we may be sure that some reading of the kind has been done. Now I venture to say,—and I hope I am not making dangerous admissions—if so President Eliot will correct me,—that if a boy should, on his admission, show that he had never seen those books, but should show also that he could write good, straight, honest English, properly spelled and punctuated, that boy would be passed in English. I am not certain of it; this is not a guarantee. I say this only to illustrate what the temper of the examination is. The question is, has the candidate read something, and can he write his mother tongue. Probably in the case I am supposing the rest of the examination would show him to be a pretty good all-round boy, whom we should be glad to get. So far as I know anything about it the feeling of the college towards the schools is that of great sympathy and interest.

And now, having said what my ideal would not be, I should like to say, for whatever it may be worth, what my ideal would be in this matter of the relation of the college and the school. I have long believed that the ideal situation would be entire independ-

ence of action in the secondary schools on the one hand and the college on the other. It seems to me that there ought to be a standard of secondary education which should be so high, so comprehensive, and so clearly recognized, that it would stand alone. It ought to be possible for a man to go into the work of secondary teaching, with such a standard in mind, as into a profession worthy of his best devotion, and of his highest powers; worthy of all that any one can put into it; a profession in which the rewards and the opportunities are quite as great, if not greater than in the so-called higher teaching. If that state of things existed, if the secondary education did have its own standards, high enough and fairly well recognized, then, it seems to me, there would be no room for this discussion at all. I think Mr. Huling said something very like this. The question of articulation would solve itself. The attitude of the schools would then be "here we are, doing our own work according to principles we believe to be right and which we are prepared to defend, and the college must take the results." The colleges, seeing the teachers and directors of the secondary schools engaged, as they now are, in a noble effort to improve and advance towards a well-defined and attainable standard, would appreciate their efforts, and that would settle the question.

The fact is that the secondary teacher is limited in many ways,—especially by this absence of recognized standards,—so that the practical question is: how shall these two stages of our education be fitted on to each other. I confess I do not exactly like the word "articulation"; it seems to suggest a kind of organic connection which I, for one, should not like to see. The influence of the higher upon the secondary instruction ought to contain just as little suggestion of compulsion as possible. The requirements for admission ought to leave to the school the largest possible measure of liberty. This brings us naturally to the question, already touched upon by Mr. Huling, of the method of admission. It was pretty thoroughly discussed at a former meeting of this association, but is sure to come up again and again until some more satisfactory solution is reached.

Mr. Huling has said that the ideal method would be by some system of certificate from the teacher. I quite agree with him; but all that I have been able to learn from observation and from the discussion here leads me to think that we are not yet ready for that change. Admission by certificate presupposes the existence of high and well recognized standards of secondary education. It presupposes that schools are not working under pressure either from their communities or from the colleges. The best proof to my mind that the certificate system is beyond us, is that teachers in general do not want it. They are not ready for the kind of responsibility it would place upon them. So it seems to me that

the wisest thing we can do under the circumstances is to keep the schools and colleges in friendly touch through all the agencies which mutual understanding and sympathy and respect may suggest. The nature of this relation is very well expressed by the interesting experiment now being tried by the Harvard Schools Examination Board. When that work began every one jumped at the conclusion that it was a first step toward admission by certificate. What the future may bring we cannot tell, but so far as I know, there is not as yet even a squint in that direction. I asked a very intelligent high school principal to tell me frankly why it had seemed worth his while to ask for the Board examination. One might have expected to hear that he desired a backing as against opposition in the community, or support in his estimate of his teachers; instead of this he told me that his position was one of almost too great liberty and responsibility. He was free to do about as he pleased, but what he desired was the approval, by men trained in the several subjects, of the methods he was following. This same principal told me that at first he had feared lest men accustomed to the college point of view should fail to enter into the spirit of school work, but he had been entirely convinced that the college was treating the question of secondary education, not merely scientifically, but also sympathetically. I remember, when this question of school inspection by colleges was in the air, hearing a school principal say at an educational meeting in a state outside of New England: "I wonder what the colleges would say if we should appoint a board to examine them." Now I don't know what other colleges might say, but I believe that Harvard College would welcome nothing more heartily than such an examination, and I think that one of the chief reasons why it would welcome it would be that it would expect the examiners to learn a great deal about the working of Harvard College, just as our examiners have learnt a great deal about the working of the schools.

And again I think the true relation of school and college for the present is well typified by the very nature of this association. I like this relation because it seems to me to follow the natural conditions of American life. The natural method of progress in our affairs is the method of free experiment. The lead in our educational progress has been taken by those institutions which were most free to make experiments, and others have followed as they approved the results of these experiments or saw their way to greater resources of their own. I should greatly fear any combination which should make such independent leadership more difficult, or which should in any way tend to check the freest experiment on the one hand and the freest criticism of experiments on the other.

THE CHAIR: Something has been said by the author of the paper about the scientific schools. I recognize in the audience President Walker, the president of one of the most prominent of these schools. We should be very glad to hear from him.

PRESIDENT WALKER: Any part I may take in the deliberations of this meeting ought to be a grateful one—grateful to me, because, as a representative of scientific and technical schools, I have only to give assent to the fundamental propositions of Dr. Huling; grateful to you, because my simple contribution will not long detain you.

So far as I am aware, there can be no occasion for the scientific and technical schools of this country to object to any of Dr. Huling's proposals. Inasmuch as those schools to-day require no more than is provided for in at least one of the courses offered by the Committee of Ten, they can possibly have no adverse interest. The report does not call upon us to make any concessions whatsoever. Any scientific school in the land would be quite content to have its students bring with them as much as is embraced in the course to which I refer. Therefore, so far as I am to speak for the scientific and technical schools, there can be no reason for doubt or hesitation in giving support to the propositions of the Committee. Indeed, so far as my constituency is concerned, the changes proposed by the Committee would be all clear gain.

This completes all I have to offer as a representative of scientific and technical schools; but, if I might venture to refer for a moment to the position of the classical colleges, I must confess that I have a great deal of sympathy with that view of the English high school which is presented in the extract quoted by Dr. Huling. I believe in the free development of the high school in this country, without constraint from the outside, and without any concession, to either the colleges or the technical schools. I believe that the high schools should not be asked to do anything more than what would be for their own best development, as schools a great majority of whose pupils are to go directly out into practical life without further advantages of education. I believe that the English high schools were created for the benefit of pupils of this class; and that they should go steadily forward upon that line, simply asking how they can best serve the needs of this portion of the community, making no surrender and no concessions to the wishes or the interests of the colleges, on the one hand, or of the scientific and technical schools on the other. The colleges have, and for a long time have had, complete control of the endowed academies and the public Latin schools. If the colleges want any more than this for their own purposes, let them provide it. If, again, the scientific schools need any more or any

different preparation from that which the high schools would give, from their own point of view and for their own proper purposes, then let the scientific and technical schools provide it for themselves. The English high school has its own definite, important work to do in the American system of education, which is to give the best possible courses of instruction to young people, between fourteen or fifteen and eighteen or nineteen years of age, who are not able to carry their studies on into the college or into the scientific or technical school. This is the proper work of the English high schools; and those who are charged with the conduct of such schools should allow nothing to divert them from that object. If the instruction given by the English high school, according to its own point of view, with reference to its own purposes, does not precisely fit its graduates for the classical college, then I say the college must come to the high school, and not the high school to the college. The desired adjustment must come through concession from the colleges, and not by surrender on the part of high schools.

The foregoing remarks might seem from their tone to be antagonistic to the report of the Committee of Ten and to the propositions of Dr. Huling; but, in fact, they are not so intended. The colleges are now doing just this very thing. They are coming to the English high school, and they are coming fast, climbing over the fences and breaking through the hedges to get as quickly as possible upon the ground of an education which omits the once universal requirement of Latin and Greek, for all college students and through practically the whole college course. The surrender has been on the part of the colleges, and not on the part of the high schools; and in the readjustments which will properly follow that surrender, the needs and the capabilities of high schools should be kept carefully in mind, rather than the needs and the convenience of the colleges.

Having long and strongly held this view of the mission of the English high school in our educational economy, I would not have those who control these schools give up one "jot or tittle" of what is for the good of the high schools themselves, according to their original idea, or in any degree divert the instruction given in such schools from the direction which will best serve those who are to end their school life at that point. But it does not seem to me that the report of the Committee of Ten and the suggestions and propositions of Dr. Huling ask anything of the high schools other than is for their own good, according to their original purposes. On the contrary, it appears to me that the programmes of the Committee of Ten are such that they might have been drawn up solely for the good of the English high schools themselves, and not at all with reference to the needs of colleges and scientific schools. I would not say that, in the point of quantity,

that is, of the amount of work required, those programmes may not transcend the present capabilities of the less favored schools; but, subject to this caution, I think that the most ardent supporter of the traditional English high school may cheerfully and cordially accept those programmes as of the nature of an enlargement and improvement of the high school, in its own interest alone.

Referring for a moment to the question of admission to colleges and scientific schools by certificate, which was brought up by Dr. Huling, I would say that, in my judgment, the general movement in this direction is a fortunate one, and is likely to be carried still further to the advantage both of the college or scientific school, and of the preparatory school, whether endowed academy, Latin school, or English high school. But it does not seem to me that there should be any effort to force this matter. The result will be better accomplished in the end if it is brought about gradually, and, indeed, by piecemeal, here a little and there a little, each individual college or scientific school proceeding by negotiation with its own special "feeders", and shaping its course according to its own particular needs. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the system of admission by certificate will ever be made universal. It is safe to say that *some* colleges can admit students by certificate from *some* preparatory schools. It is perhaps safe to say that *some* colleges could safely admit by certificate from *all* preparatory schools. It is possible that *all* colleges might admit by certificate from *some* preparatory schools. But to say that *all* colleges could admit students by certificate from *all* preparatory schools, is going a great deal further than the results of experience justify.

Regarding the complaints cited by Dr. Huling, which impeach the results of examinations for admission to college, I would like to say a word.

It seems to me that an altogether false idea obtains respecting the proper significance and effect of these examinations. It appears to be a common notion that the successful passing of entrance examinations not only vests in an applicant the right to enter the school or college, but also the right not to have any other applicant, who has not passed the examinations, admitted. Hence, we have anonymous examinations, the candidates being known only by numbers assigned to them individually, with a hard-and-fast rule that those who pass the examinations with a certain degree of success shall be permitted to enter, and that all who fall short of that point shall be rejected.

It seems to me that this view of the significance and effect of examinations is altogether wrong. The prime object of holding entrance examinations is to save young men from beginning courses in which they would probably fail through lack of prepa-

ration. The examination is primarily and principally, not for the sake of the school or college, but for the sake of the applicant; that he may not suffer disappointment; that he may not lose his time and money in a futile attempt to carry on courses which are beyond his ability. A school or college, on its part, would suffer no particular harm by having a certain number of ill-prepared students enter its first class. It is the students themselves who would suffer; and it is for their sake that entrance examinations are held. From this point of view, the examinations merely become a sieve which rapidly and confidently separates the body of applicants into two general classes: those who are manifestly well prepared, and those regarding whom it is probable that they are not prepared. But no reason exists why there should not be further inquiry and careful consideration regarding any person who has failed in the formal examination, especially any person who has passed the usual age of admission, as to whether he may not, in spite of that, be fairly qualified to begin the studies of the school or college. Regarding the great majority of those who fail at formal examinations for admission, there is, of course, little to be said; the one thing they need is to go back to preparatory schools and do their work, or certain portions of it, over again. Among those rejected on first trial, however, often are found men whose partial failure is due to causes easily explained. Justice, not less than kindness, requires that such persons should not be compelled to lose a year of life, perhaps practically be debarred from a further educational career. Certainly, to say that an applicant who has been admitted has a right to object to the admission of others, is to give the examinations a significance and an effect which are unreasonable. In the school with which I am connected, I think there has been no year for a long time in which the faculty have not, after carefully considering the cases of rejected men, where there appeared to be reason to believe that the examinations had not proved a fair or a conclusive test, admitted one or more such persons. They have never felt themselves precluded from dealing with any case upon its own merits. If it was found that an applicant was, by reason of temperament, always at a disadvantage in examinations; that his preparatory school record showed that he did better in current, daily work than upon review or parade; and especially, if he bore a character for fidelity, industry, and persistency, he might be admitted in the face of examination marks below the standard. In other words, if I may use a technical expression, we have always at the Institute of Technology felt entirely at liberty, so far as examinations are concerned, to "work over the tailings", and extract and save any valuable metal we might find there.

MR. TETLOW: There is a gentleman here whose exceptional experience in matters connected with the subject under discussion should make his opinion of great value. I will ask President Eliot to speak. Will the gentleman take the platform?

PRESIDENT ELIOT: *Ladies and Gentlemen:* The Report of the Committee of Ten states clearly, I think, the main principles which have been the subject of discussion this afternoon; and I may say that for myself I accept the Report of that Committee as it has been placed in your hands. But there are one or two points raised in the discussion, or mentioned in the excellent paper of Dr. Huling, on which I will say a few words at the call of your Chairman.

I have observed that a deal of mischief may sometimes be done by a phrase. The inventors of phrases often do harm without intending to. Twenty-six years ago I wanted a title for two articles in the *Atlantic Monthly* which described a kind of education which was then somewhat novel, but has now become familiar,—the education given in the scientific and technical schools,—and I unfortunately called those two articles “The New Education.” I still see that phrase used almost every month in newspaper and magazine discussions; and I must say that it is often applied to methods of education which seem to me deceptive and injurious. I have regretted over and over again that the phrase ever occurred to me.

Now we have heard a phrase this afternoon which has been reverberating around the country these many months. It seems to me to be full of mischief because full of falsity. It was quoted this afternoon by Dr. Huling. It is the phrase that the American high schools prepare for life, whereas the classical schools, preparatory schools, and academies prepare for college.

You perceive in this phrase, ladies and gentlemen, an anti-thetical argument which has a peculiar fascination for many minds; but it does not bear examination. If there is anything plain in the world, it is that the college prepares for life, and that the scientific school prepares for life; and that they give the more fortunate youth who are able to resort to them a better preparation for life,—that is, for earning a livelihood, making themselves serviceable, and enjoying existence,—than can possibly be given

by the American high school, or by any school which trains youth up to only the eighteenth or nineteenth year. Our colleges train young men as best they know how for the actual conflicts and struggles of life; and the American colleges, like the American scientific schools, are doing a very serviceable work in training for American life the young men and women who are fortunate enough to go to them. The American high school gives a valuable training to the young men and women who are obliged to begin to earn their livings at eighteen or nineteen years of age. The life on which they then enter is in all probability an inferior life, and a less rewarded life, than those same persons would have entered upon if their circumstances had permitted them to have a longer training. This is one inevitable fact that needs to be plainly stated. But unfortunately there is a second fact, not inevitable, which is not so generally recognized and acknowledged as it should be,—the fact, namely, that this education which the American high school has heretofore given to those less fortunate persons whose education must cease at eighteen or nineteen, has been a less well-planned and a less judicious education than their more fortunate comrades, whose education is to be prolonged until they are twenty-five or twenty-six years old, receive up to eighteen or nineteen. In other words, to the great loss of the country, the education given by the American high school, on the average and thus far, has been an inferior education up to the eighteenth or nineteenth year to the education given in classical and preparatory schools.

What the Committee of Ten tried to do was to recommend courses of instruction in secondary schools which would make the education of those who are obliged to stop at eighteen or nineteen years of age as good up to that age as the education of those who are fortunate enough to receive a systematic training up to their twenty-fifth or twenty-sixth year. That equal chance up to eighteen or nineteen years of age has never yet been given in this country to those whose education stops there. The Committee of Ten state explicitly that they were not guided in their recommendations by a desire to serve particularly those who could go to college. It was their chief object to serve that large number whose education must stop at eighteen or nineteen, and also to serve that great majority of American children whose education

stops at fourteen or fifteen, although the Committee was not expressly appointed to do so. They saw clearly that the chief interest in improving the elementary school programme lay in the welfare of those children who could go no farther, and that the same thing was true of the secondary school programme. They believed that the solution of the problem was to be found in making the programme of each year the best thing possible in itself, that best thing being in the main the same for children whose education is to be short and for those whose education is to be prolonged.

Two or three other considerations occurred to me as I was listening to the remarks of previous speakers. President Walker seemed to me to misapprehend the position taken in the Report of the Committee of Ten towards the scientific and technical schools. What the Committee of Ten ask of the authorities of such schools is, not that they should accept as qualified for admission young men who have passed through some one of the programmes recommended by the Committee of Ten, but that they should cease admitting to their schools young men who have not accomplished the half of any one of those programmes. It is the plain fact that the scientific and technological schools of this country,—I have in mind no particular school, and my remark would apply just as well to the Lawrence Scientific school, or to the Sheffield Scientific school, as to the Institute of Technology,—have admitted young men by hundreds who have never accomplished anything like the course of instruction provided in any one of the programmes recommended by the Committee of Ten. The Committee, I am sure, would unanimously desire that the scientific and technological schools should raise their requirements for admission, until these schools should give a real support to secondary education. At present they are eating into the secondary schools. They receive secondary school pupils one year, and even two years before they have finished a fair secondary school course. What the Committee ask of the scientific and technological schools is, therefore, that they make a substantial increase in their requirements for admission.

I have been for twenty-five years an ardent advocate of serious modifications in the admission requirements for American colleges; but I desire to say that I have never been in favor of any modifi-

cation which made the requirements easier. Such changes as have been made in the requirements for admission to Harvard College have always been in the direction of making them harder. When certain subjects were accepted at the Harvard College admission examination as substitutes for the Greek, which had formerly been required of all, the substitutes were harder than the Greek. I believe that fact to be universally admitted by all schools which have prepared pupils in the substitutes for Greek. Is there anything in this position inconsistent with the Report of the Committee of Ten, which advocates the acceptance by colleges of young men who have accomplished, not the Classical programme only, but the Latin-Scientific, the Modern Language, or the English programme? I firmly believe that there is no inconsistency whatever between the Report of the Committee of Ten and the doctrine that requirements for admission to college should not be made easier. For one, I would not have supported or recommended in any way those four programmes, if I had not supposed them to be of approximately equal difficulty. If I had supposed that the so-called English programme was easier than the Classical, I would not have voted for it. It is just because I believe that any one of those programmes is as hard as any other, and therefore may be made the vehicle of as good a training as any other, that I believe it to be wise for the colleges to accept the training in any one of them as qualifying for admission. If any one of those programmes turns out to be easier than any other, it will be thereby condemned. I believe them all to call for approximately the same amount of labor or mental application; and personally I further believe that the intellectual and ethical contents of every one of the four programmes can be made equally good; but on this point of contents I think there would be differences of opinion in the Committee. The Committee do say that in the present condition of American education,—including in this phrase the present means of training teachers,—they believe that it will generally be easier to carry out well the Classical programme than to carry out well the Modern Language programme or the English. That present condition, however, may obviously prove only a temporary difficulty.

The four programmes recommended by the Committee of Ten were referred to this afternoon as ideals for the secondary schools.

In some sense they are; and I hope that no good teacher has thought them to be impracticable ideals, towards which it is no use to struggle. I believe them not only to be practicable ideals now, but I also think them to be ideals which in ten or fifteen years will cease to be ideals at all. Those programmes are to my thinking purely temporary in their character, sure to be replaced before long by better programmes; and this for the simple reason that they rest upon the existing programmes of the elementary schools. We already see very plainly that great modifications and improvements are being made, and are to be made, in the elementary schools. So soon as algebra, geometry, physics, and the elements of a foreign language are successfully dealt with in the grammar schools, it will be possible to improve greatly every one of the four programmes of the Committee of Ten. I therefore rather dislike to hear those programmes spoken of as ideals.

Professor Emerton liked Dr. Huling's paper because it suggested no scheme. I can sympathize with that feeling, for I have been the constant advocate of diversity in education; but nevertheless I recognize the fact that there is a kind of uniformity in school programmes which is capable of advancing our national system of education. I have to admit that a closer articulation between grammar schools and secondary schools, or between secondary schools and colleges and scientific schools, cannot be much advanced, unless some scheme can be worked out by which a standard of attainment can be set up for each subject of instruction at certain rather definite stages of the whole course of training from six to eighteen years of age. It is an interesting problem how such standards are to be set up in our country, where there can be no governmental control of education. It seems to me that our substitute for the governmental control which exists in such countries as France and Germany must be found in some combination of colleges and universities acting coöperatively with selected secondary schools. I believe it is time that such a scheme of coöperative action should be proposed and studied.

At this point President L. Clark Seelye was called to the chair.

DR. TETLOW: I want to express my thanks to President Eliot for saying so aptly some things I desired to say myself, and for—

PRESIDENT ELIOT: May I ask the speaker, Mr. President, to take the platform. [Laughter.]

DR. TETLOW: My attention also was attracted by what Professor Emerton said about the absence of any scheme from Dr. Huling's paper. I feel, too, that, vicious as artificial schemes may be, rational schemes are helpful. I believe they are the scaffolding by the aid of which every structure that is built in accordance with sound educational principles has to be raised. Thus Harvard College, for ten years past, has had in operation a scheme of entrance examinations which has set a standard, or rather a variety of standards. I understand that this scheme is likely soon to give place to a different scheme, presumably a better, but which, if better, will owe its superiority to the experience gained through that which has been in operation for the last ten years. I think it is universally conceded that the four programmes offered by the Committee of Ten are better than most of the secondary school programmes now in use, though they are by no means ideal in the sense of being perfect. They present a standard towards which it is worth while for the secondary schools to work. If this is true, it is worth while for us to recognize them ourselves, and to procure recognition for them on the part of those institutions to which we are accustomed to look for leadership in education.

I should like, therefore, to see those programmes receive official sanction from the colleges and scientific schools to this extent: that the satisfactory completion of any one of those courses of study shall be accepted as adequate preparation for admission to college or scientific school. I should like to have such sanction cover a period of ten years. That is what I understand President Eliot to mean by the word "temporary". If we could have generally established throughout New England such a standard as that for a period of ten years, I am quite sure that the high schools would show a much stronger disposition to turn towards those programmes as ideals than they will if no sort of scheme is presented. I have therefore prepared a set of resolutions, which I will respectfully offer for adoption.

#### RESOLUTIONS.

*Resolved*, That the interests of education would be promoted by a closer articulation than now exists between the secondary schools and the higher institutions of New England.

*Resolved*, That, as an effective means of securing such closer articulation, the satisfactory completion of any one of the four courses of study embodied in the programmes submitted on pages 46 and 47 of the Report

of the Committee of Ten should be accepted as an adequate preparation for corresponding courses in colleges and scientific schools.

*Resolved*, That the authorities of the colleges and scientific schools represented in this association be, and they hereby are, requested to take such action as will give effect to the foregoing implied recommendation.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be requested to send a copy of these resolutions to the President and Faculty of every college and scientific school represented in this association, and that the Committee of Conference be requested to bring the same to the attention of the Commission of Colleges in New England, and to request that body to take appropriate action thereon.

I believe, if the colleges and scientific schools should take the action that is here by implication recommended, that many high schools, or groups of high schools, for I have in mind especially the high schools of Boston, would make application, through their principals, to the school authorities of their several localities for a modification of present courses of study in the direction, at least, of the programmes offered by the Committee of Ten. I am of the opinion that those programmes include more work than the high schools can do, and I should be glad to have some substitutions allowed in them; but they present an ideal standard towards which it is worth while to work.

THE CHAIR: *Ladies and Gentlemen*: You hear the resolutions as presented, and they are subject to your action. Are they to be seconded?

PROFESSOR FAY: I second the resolutions.

Dr. Tetlow resumed the chair.

MR. WILLIAM C. COLLAR: *Mr. President*: I arose to say that if it were necessary to have the resolutions seconded at this time, or if it were considered desirable, I should be very happy to make such a motion, but it has occurred to me that it might be better if the resolutions were to lie upon the table and be printed and be called up for discussion at a subsequent meeting. I suppose the object of passing those resolutions would be to give a strong recommendation to the conclusions of the Committee of Ten in respect to those programmes; and it occurs to me that we are scarcely ready at this moment to take decisive action. I should guess that it would be very complimentary to estimate that there are twenty persons in this audience now who have studied and com-

pared those four programmes so as to be able to say that they would heartily, without any reservation, second the resolutions; and I am sure that a good discussion would add weight to the final recommendation, which I presume would be the result of a discussion. I therefore suggest,—I will not make the motion, because I don't know but a majority of those present would prefer to take action,—I would suggest that the resolutions lie upon the table, be printed, and called up for discussion at the next meeting of the association.

DR. MOSES MERRILL: I am ready to vote for these resolutions to-day; but it seems to me that Mr. Collar has made a good suggestion, that they be printed and that copies be sent to the members of the association for them to read and compare with the programmes of the Committee of Ten. We can consider the matter at the next meeting much more intelligently than we can this afternoon.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I think the hesitation to second the motion promptly communicated a state of mind told of by Mr. Merrill. While I am prepared to vote at once for the resolutions, I think greater weight would be attached to the result that should be reached at the session to-morrow, after they have been printed and in the members' hands.

A MEMBER: Is it practicable to have them printed so as to be ready for the members to-morrow?

MR. COLLAR: When I suggested another meeting, I meant a year from this time, because the programme is made for to-morrow, and there certainly could not be adequate discussion on them then.

MR. ARTHUR L. GOODRICH: I feel the importance of the point that has been mentioned: I also feel strongly that postponing this matter a year puts it in great danger of becoming out of date and therefore of losing weight in a certain way. If we could have another meeting six months from now I should be heartily in favor of postponing until that time, but postponing a year seems to me too long.

One other point. I also feel very strongly opposed to the requirements of the committee in their programmes, so far as the total of the time allowance is concerned,—the 20 periods per week. It seems to me too great. It is useless to set up the statement that the colleges would accept for admission the completion of any of those programmes, if we cannot hope to adopt them. It is my

feeling personally that it is impossible for high schools, as at present constituted, to maintain that number of recitation periods during the four years.

PROFESSOR FAY: My rising to second the resolutions was largely formal, as I supposed it would be impossible to discuss or treat them unless they were seconded; but there lay behind that a profound sympathy with the motion,—the hope that something might be done this year, at this meeting, to give some effect to the discussion we have had thus far. I feel as much as any one can the slight value of hasty action on the part of persons who do not understand the details of a matter which they are discussing, and would certainly be ready to accept the opinion of the majority as to whether or not it is desirable to postpone the matter for a year.

THE CHAIR: The Secretary informs me that the resolutions will be reported in full in the morning papers.

PRESIDENT E. H. CAPEN: It seems to me the resolutions embody the general substance of our discussion this afternoon, presented in the admirable paper of Mr. Huling and the remarks of those who have followed him in the discussion, and so far as I have observed there has been no dissent from the opinions expressed; therefore, it seems to me we are substantially in accord with the sentiment of the resolutions. For that reason, in order that we may go forward in this great movement, it seems to me desirable at this session at least, and this session closes to-morrow, that some action should be taken, that they should not be deferred for a year. And this will be possible if the resolutions can be in our hands for discussion to-morrow morning.

DR. WILLIAM T. PECK: I think this is a very pressing and important matter. I had the pleasure of looking over yesterday the catalogues of fourteen of the New England colleges out of the sixteen or seventeen that belong to our association, and I found that many of them are moving in the direction of offering different requirements for admission, adapted more or less to the English high schools; and the movement is very various indeed. If this movement goes on, it will be more difficult to secure unity of requirement, than if we proceed rapidly towards the step that, no doubt, seems to be in the mind of many throughout the country. Taking the old basis of the high school programme with three lessons a day for four years, we might estimate that there were necessary twelve years of work with one lesson a day in the high school to accomplish the old classical requirements for admission to college.

Looking over these new requirements I find, figuring upon the amount of work usually given in first grade preparatory schools, that some of them would take seven and one-half years, some would take six and one-half years, and some would take only five years at one lesson per day. I hope I am understood. I mean that while by a recitation three times a day for four years, making twelve years of work at one lesson a day, the uniform requirements can be accomplished, some of these requirements can be met in much less time by English and scientific high schools.

Indeed some colleges at the present time present requirements that would not demand over two years of an ordinary high school's course of study. These requirements are found under Scientific, Latin-Scientific, Literary, and Engineering courses. A variety of work is now presented. It seems to me that what President Eliot suggested about scientific schools interfering with the work of the high schools is also true to-day in regard to the requirements of various colleges in New England, which allow admission on work that by three recitations per day can be done in two years, or two and a half, reducing so much the requirements of the regular time of four years. I think if we cannot pass these resolutions, if we cannot agree to the details of the four courses of the Committee of Ten, we can so mould these resolutions to-morrow, that we may adopt something that may be given to the Commission of New England Colleges. The ropes by which the changes are worked are very long indeed, and we know from past experience that it took years to accomplish the various changes we have secured. It seems to me that, if this is referred to a year from this time, we shall lose the favorable opportunity and much valuable time will be lost. I hope before the session closes some resolutions will be passed.

It was then voted that the resolutions be laid upon the table until ten o'clock on Saturday morning, and that then a half hour should be devoted to discussion upon them.

MR. D. W. HOYT: I would like to ask a question of President Eliot, as to just what he means by these twenty periods a week,—whether he would insist upon more than fifteen periods, and whether this includes all laboratory work. We have been at work a year on this very question. We have moved our courses very largely towards the Report of the Committee of Ten. We have doubts exactly upon this point, whether we can reach quite the standard which is there set.

PRESIDENT ELIOT: Before the Committee of Ten began their own proper work they sent out inquiries to about 200 secondary

schools to ascertain, among other things, what the commonest recitation period was. The answers to these inquiries demonstrated that far the commonest periods were forty and forty-five minutes. The Committee accepted this result of experience, and they always use the term period to mean not more than forty-five minutes. Twenty periods, therefore, do not mean twenty hours. The Committee believe that a school can be conducted with perfect precision and good order with periods of either forty or forty-five minutes; although some experienced teachers seem to attach great importance to the hour as the unit for the division of school time. Again, in recommending twenty periods of forty or forty-five minutes each, the Committee, as they expressly state, intended that five of those periods should require no previous preparation on the part of the pupil. There remain therefore only fifteen lessons a week to be prepared. There are ordinarily twenty-five full hours of school time in a week, and twenty periods of forty-five minutes each take only fifteen hours. Two-fifths of the school time will still remain unoccupied to be devoted to study or laboratory work. It is therefore perfectly practicable to prepare programmes in which every laboratory subject shall have a double period whenever it occurs; but it was not the intention of the Committee that the whole of this double period should be given to laboratory work,—on the contrary they would always use a part of the double period for demonstrations before the whole class, or for recitation.

While I personally believe that it will be found possible to use the twenty periods that the Committee recommended, I also think that changes in this respect should be made gradually. A community which is habituated to the common arrangement of three recitations a day five days in the week, cannot be abruptly brought up to twenty exercises a week, even though five of them require no previous preparation. Somehow or other we have established in this country an exceedingly low standard of work for children in schools; the amount of study done by the pupils, and the amount of genuine teaching done by the teachers, are both deplorably low. The average American parent has got fixed in his mind too low a standard of mental work for his children. We cannot make a good school, or a good school system, until this fundamental difficulty has been overcome.

It is to be observed that the standard of work in schools was higher forty or fifty years ago than it is now. School work has become in some respects more mechanical and uniform, and therefore more irksome and fatiguing, because the interest which an intelligent child can take in it has diminished. The number of school hours in a week is smaller now than it was forty years ago. The real difficulty is the dulness of school routine. The remedy for the evil which has been called overwork is therefore the in-

crease of interest combined with physical training and good ventilation. These are some of the grounds of hope that the twenty period recommendation of the Committee of Ten may gradually be carried into effect in the course of five or ten years. I think it should be mentioned that there are already a considerable number of schools which use twenty periods.

DR. HULING: I hope President Eliot will not pass from the platform until he has explained a little more plainly to those of us whose memory does not extend back so far, how it was that American children accomplished more at that earlier period than they accomplish now.

THE CHAIR: Before President Eliot touches that question, I should like to say that the programmes of the Committee of Ten do demand more work. I don't believe that the American high school is going to give to other subjects the place of drawing and singing,—drawing two hours a week and singing one hour a week,—and the time of those two subjects must come from the twenty periods. I might say, as a matter of fact, that the Girls' Latin School has been working with the twenty periods for sixteen years. But the programmes of the Committee of Ten make no provision whatever for those two spaces which the American people are not going to surrender.

PRESIDENT ELIOT: I will first say a word in reply to what has just been said by Dr. Tetlow. I hope with him that the American high school is not going to drop either drawing or music. Those would indeed be steps backward. I could wish that the schools called fitting or preparatory would introduce drawing and music, because drawing at any rate is one of the most essential means of studying sciences. I am sure that the Committee of Ten had not the slightest intention of recommending the omission of either drawing or music. Speaking for myself alone, and not for the Committee, I may say that drawing, like music, can, in my opinion, begin very early, at the first stages of education, and should be carried forward by the child steadily from the beginning in the kindergarten through the primary and grammar grades. If that were done, high school pupils would probably not need to have separate hours on the programme set apart for drawing, any more than for reading and writing. The practice in drawing would be kept up incidentally.

In reply to Dr. Huling's very natural question, I can only mention some facts about the schools of fifty years ago which seem to me to be relevant. In the first place, as I have already mentioned, the actual numbers of school hours per week was then larger.

There were also two sessions in secondary schools instead of one. The vacations have been prolonged,—that is, there is more vacation time in the secondary school year now than there was forty years ago,—and the same is true concerning college vacations. Further, it seems to me that the pressure exerted by parents on their children to work for intellectual advancement has distinctly diminished, and that the distractions taking the attention of children from school work have distinctly increased. For pupils from thirteen to eighteen years of age the permitted distractions from mental labor have increased very much within my memory. All colleges, as well as all secondary schools, suffer from this cause. The remedies for this state of things are doubtless complex and slow of application; but the principal remedy I believe must be found in a change of mind on the part of the parents. American parents must come to see, what European parents of intelligence have long seen, that in the strenuous competition of the modern world the chances of their children in life are favorably affected by a substantial and well-directed training in youth, and are very unfavorably affected by a slight and misdirected training.

The Association then took an adjournment until evening.

#### FRIDAY EVENING.

The Association reassembled at 7:45, with Dr. Tetlow in the chair. The speaker of the evening was President William DeWitt Hyde, of Bowdoin College, whose address was on "Educational Values as Assessed by the Committee of Ten."

PRESIDENT HYDE: In transmitting the Report of the Committee of Ten to the Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner Harris remarks, "The recommendations of this Report will draw the attention of great numbers of teachers to the question of educational values."

What then are the elements of educational value? And how do the recommendations of the Committee stand the test of examination in the light of the standards which modern pedagogics have established? Such an inquiry involves first a brief statement of what education is for, and why study is worth while: and then a detailed consideration of the kind of education the Committee approve, and the programmes they propose. The latter will involve liberal quotation from the Report itself; which is by no means a misfortune. For in the midst of the flood of talk

about the Report, there is danger that the actual recommendations will be overlooked, or only vaguely apprehended.

Education does not consist in the mere acquisition of information; any more than good physical condition consists in the consumption of food. Proper quantity and quality of food is essential to physical health. The right kind and amount of information is an important element in education. But to assume that the possession of a certain amount and kind of information is itself education would be to confound the living process with the dead material on which it works. Education is nothing less than the development of intellectual life. Enjoyable, effective, complete life is the end of education. Whatever contributes to this end has educational value. All else is worthless or injurious.

Enjoyable, effective, complete intellectual life involves three conditions which education must fulfil: interest; power; and scope. Interest depends largely on the timeliness and tact with which subjects are presented. Power depends on the consecutiveness and concentration with which they are pursued. Scope depends on the range of subjects which are introduced.

A good school programme, therefore, is one which presents subjects at that time and in that order which awakens and sustains interest; which prosecutes each subject with sufficient consecutiveness and thoroughness to develop power and mastery over its principles and methods; and which affords sufficient variety to draw out the different sides of each individual and the different capacities of different individuals.

These are the standards of educational value. By these standards school programmes henceforth must be tested. Programmes which, when weighed in these balances, are found wanting should be discarded. Programmes which meet these requirements should be the programmes of the future.

Let us then apply these tests one by one to the programme outlined by the Committee of Ten.

First: Interest. Interest depends on timeliness and tact in the presentation of a subject. The traditional curriculum separates each subject from every other; reads in reading-books; writes in writing-books; spells words in spelling-books; studies geography in geography books; grammar in grammar books; literature in literature-books: all without the slightest intimation that one of

these abstract and bookish subjects has any relation to another; or that they all together have anything to do with reality and life. Each subject must be acquired by a dead lift. Each piece of information is stowed away in a separate pigeon hole of the memory; whence it can be drawn out for examination and exhibition; but to which the pupil would never think of going for ordinary exercise and use. This isolation of subjects is fatal to interest. Interest depends largely upon the extension of the known and familiar into new and untried fields. But where each topic is taken up in isolation from every other, the fundamental conditions of interest are wanting.

On the contrary the Committee recommends "that the different subjects should be correlated and associated one with another by the programme and by the actual teaching, and that every subject should help every other; and that the teacher of each single subject should feel responsible for the advancement of the pupils in all subjects, and should distinctly contribute to this advancement".

Thus physical measurement will furnish material for arithmetical calculation; natural history will afford exercise in drawing; history, literature, and translation from foreign languages will furnish material for exercise in English; geography will help history; and the foreign languages will react helpfully upon the understanding of our mother tongue. By linking together the several subjects in mutual association and welding them together in constant use there is presented at once a motive for the retention of the old and an interest in the acquisition of the new subjects.

The traditional curriculum drew hard and fast lines between even related subjects. Arithmetic was continued into its remotest ramifications and technical applications before a hint of algebraic method was given. The proposed programme would curtail or omit from the course in arithmetic such subjects as "compound proportion, cube root, abstract mensuration, obsolete denominative quantities, and the greater part of commercial arithmetic. Percentage should be rigidly reduced to the needs of actual life." In place of wasting valuable energy in fruitless struggles with problems in these subjects which they are too young and inexperienced to comprehend, and of which without actual business

experience they can form no clear conception, the Report recommends that "a course of instruction in concrete geometry, with numerous exercises, be introduced into the grammar school; and that some familiarity with algebraic expressions and symbols, including the methods of solving simple equations, should be acquired in connection with the course in arithmetic."

The new programme also appeals to interest by the concreteness and reality of its problems. In place of problems from a printed book, the Report commends "measurements of the room, the house and the yard; the calculation of the weights of visible objects, or the number of articles that a given receptacle will hold; the computation of distances and areas in the town, by measures on a map of known scale, of the number of cubic feet in a room, and of the weight of the air which fills the room," as the proper problems to awaken and sustain interest in the study of arithmetic.

In geography the Report urges that "observation should go before all other forms of geographical study, and prepare the way for them. The work of observation should begin with those features that lie immediately about the pupils. In rural districts natural geography, as seen in the forms of the land, the hills, valleys, plains, meadows, divides, streams, lakes, etc., will predominate; while in cities artificial or humanistic geography will receive leading attention, as streets, railways, wharves, harbors, parks, plots, wards, etc.; but something of both these groups of subjects may be found and utilized in both localities. They should observe the agencies that produce surface changes, such as winds, rains, floods, thawing, freezing, cultivation, etc. Excursions for observational work in geography should be made as frequently as possible. Immediately after the making of observations should come their reproduction in the form of descriptions, sketches, maps, models, etc." By this means pupils are led up naturally to a realistic sense of the meaning of maps, and an ability to read them.

English likewise is not relegated to a special time and place under the head of grammar and compositions. The Report declares that "every lesson in geography or physics or mathematics may and should become a part of the pupil's training in English. There can be no more appropriate moment for a brief lesson in ex-

pression, than the moment when the pupil has something which he is trying to express." During the first two years at school children may acquire fluency of expression by reproducing orally in their own words stories told them by their teachers and by inventing stories about objects and pictures. Not earlier than the thirteenth year of the pupil's age formal grammar may be taken up. Probably a single year (not more than three times a week) will be sufficient. At the beginning of the seventh school year the reading-book may be discarded, and the pupil should henceforth read literature. Complete works should usually be studied. Children should be taught to comprehend the subject matter as a whole and to grasp the significance of parts. The history of English literature should be taught incidentally, in connection with the study of particular authors and works; the mechanical use of "manuals of literature should be avoided, and the committing to memory of names and dates should not be mistaken for culture."

In Latin the Report proposes to substitute the human interest of Nepos's "Lives" for the uninteresting details and military vocabulary and restricted range of Caesar's Gallic War. It cites as things to be avoided: dispersion of effort in the attempt to include too many parts of the study in the first stage; an undue prominence of rules, and the treatment of syntax as an end in itself, rather than as an auxiliary to the penetration of the sense; and the use of translation English; and presents as the end of the study of Latin "insight into the thought and feeling of a people who have contributed very largely to make the life of the civilized world what it is to-day".

The other departments offer numerous suggestions for the quickening of interest in their respective branches. The Greek Conference would substitute the *Odyssey* for the *Iliad*, on the ground that "the *Odyssey* deals with fairy land, enchantment, and human effort. The *Iliad*, on the other hand, treats of deeds that belong to gods and heroes, the conflicts seem far from us, and lack the human interest that Odysseus' adventures have." They object to "having a lesson translated in small portions of a few lines each, since nothing can be devised to destroy all interest in the subject matter read more thoroughly than this habit"; and

urge that "during some part of each recitation hour a connected translation of the whole lesson be made."

The Conference on Modern Languages recommends the introduction of German or French into the grammar schools rather than Latin "because living languages are better adapted to grammar school work, both on account of the greater ease with which they can be taught and learned, and because of their closer relation to the interests and ideas of to-day." They "believe that children should begin French or German by the time they are ten years old. At this age their perceptions are acute, their vocal organs are still flexible, interest is easily kindled, and they are eager to imbibe the life and spirit of a foreign tongue."

The Conference on Physics, Chemistry, and Astronomy, in the same spirit recommends "that the study of simple natural phenomena be introduced into the elementary schools, and be pursued by means of experiments carried on by the pupil, in order that in the early stages of education the mind may be prepared for the study of things and of phenomena by direct contact, and not rendered unfit for it."

The Conference on Natural History declares, "It must be remembered that the primary object of nature study is not that the children may get a knowledge of plants and animals. The first purpose of the work is to interest them in nature. The children should study the plant as a whole, not merely as a part; as a living organism, not merely as a form or structure. Study should proceed from simple to complex forms; and disagreeable features of the subject should be postponed until the interest of the student has been secured."

The Conference on History condemns the memorizing of detached historical facts, lifeless dates, details of military movements, and declares that "it is better to omit history altogether than to teach it by setting pupils painfully to reproduce the words of a text-book". They commend "in the first two years oral instruction in biography and mythology, supplemented by the reading of simple biographies and mythological stories; the topical method of study; outside reading; practice in discriminating between authorities; committing to memory historical poems; off-hand discussions; impromptu debates; open text-book recitations in which with their books before them, pupils are asked questions

on cause and effect, and trained to take in the thought of a printed page, and to grasp the essential points."

Thus every one of the nine conferences proposes, by earlier introduction, or by closer co-ordination, or by improved methods, by closer contact with realities and by more direct appeal to the pupil's native instincts and capacities, to awaken that interest in the subject studied which is the first and fundamental element of educational value. The old curriculum taught in the old way is dry, dead, dreary. The new programme taught in the new way cannot fail to be fresh, vital, stimulating. In thus putting interesting subjects, introduced at the interesting time, in interesting relations, and taught in interesting ways, in place of supposed useful or merely disciplinary subjects, introduced too early to be comprehended or too late to be appreciated; presented out of their proper relation to each other, and taught by mechanical methods out of mechanical text-books, the Committee of Ten have given to interest a foremost place in educational values. Without repeating the name of Herbart, they have done his will; and given the foremost place to the principle for which he contended. Happy will be the generation of children who shall see this principle embodied in practice, and these programmes put into operation.

Interest, however, is but one element in educational value. Interest in the matter studied draws the mind out toward it. Yet the initiative remains after all external rather than internal, so long as we rely upon interest alone. The next step in education is to develop power. The pupil must be trained to take the initiative himself. He must be taught to take matter which is inherently unattractive and uninteresting, and by imposing upon it the forms of his own understanding, reason, and imagination, clothe it with a charm and beauty not its own. Unless to responsiveness to the uninterestingness of the object you add a development of the power of the mind itself, education remains a relatively passive process; and the mind becomes flabby, weak, dependent. The modern error of making education so easy and attractive that the pupil has to put forth little or no effort of his own, is even more serious than the old error of setting him to do dreary and meaningless and impossible tasks, without rational guidance or sympathetic interpretation. Have the Committee of

Ten adequately recognised this second element of educational value?

As interest depends largely on the time and manner in which a subject is introduced, power depends in great measure on the length of time during which it is pursued. And the Report is emphatic in demanding that studies shall be studied continuously as well as begun earlier. It declares that "all subjects should be taught consecutively enough and extensively enough to make every subject yield that training which it is best fitted to yield. If every subject is to provide a substantial mental training, it must have a time-allotment sufficient to produce that fruit. Selection of a few subjects is necessary to thoroughness, and to the imparting of power as distinguished from information; for any large subject whatever, to yield its training value, must be pursued through several years and be studied from three to five times a week." Their chief criticism of secondary school courses as now too often arranged is that "the pupil goes through a course of a very feeble and scrappy nature—studying a little of many subjects and not much of any one, getting, perhaps, a little information in a variety of fields, but nothing which can be called a thorough training." They "omit all short information courses."

Another condition of power is that a subject shall be grasped as a whole, in the unity of its organic relations, rather than as a series of isolated parts. Each conference treats its subject as an organic whole. The Latin Conference urges that practice in writing Latin should not be dissociated from practice in reading and translating, but the two should be carried on with equal steps. The Greek Conference "does not favor any examination upon grammar apart from questions suggested by the text set for translation." English is not to be a thing apart from all other subjects. "It is a fundamental idea in this Report that the study of every other subject should contribute to the pupil's training in English; and that the pupil's capacity to write English should be made available, and be developed, in every other department."

Physical geography, according to the conception of the Committee, "would embrace in its scope the elements of half-a-dozen natural sciences, and would bind together in one sheaf the various gleanings gathered from widely separated fields."

The chief means of developing power must be the independent reaction of the pupil upon the matter studied. The active rather than the passive, the constructive rather than the receptive attitude of mind is the condition of the development of mental power. On this point the recommendations of the conferences are emphatic and unanimous.

Not a mere mechanical translation into "translation English", but first an understanding of the Latin or Greek sentence in the original before translating, and then a rendering into idiomatic English is the standard set up by these conferences. Carefully studied written translation from the foreign language into English; and constant translation of English into the foreign languages; together with continuous practice in sight reading, render it impossible for the pupil who is taught according to these recommendations to evade, either by "ponies" or other devices, the drill and discipline these languages are calculated to impart. The Conference on Mathematics insists on rigorous demonstrations, more attention to facility and correctness of work; the application of principles to the problems as fast as they are acquired; and an abundance of original demonstrations in geometry, in which the pupil is called upon to "devise constructions and demonstrations for himself."

The Conferences on the Sciences recognise the danger of exclusive reliance on either text-book or laboratory; and urge a combination of both, supplemented by careful questioning by the teacher.

The Conference on History by comparison of different authorities, by the topical method of study, by the intensive study of at least one period, by tracing the relation of cause and effect, by reports on collateral reading, and by debates on points on which authorities differ, proposes a course in history which will be inferior to no other subjects in "cultivating the powers of discriminating observation; strengthening the logical faculty of following an argument; and improving the process of comparison, that is, the judgment."

Finally the Report would secure energetic and forcible reaction upon all subjects studied by requiring accurate expression. Pupils should be trained to tell what they have learned, as well as to see and to reason. The language conferences insist on accurate,

elegant, and idiomatic translations. The Conference on Mathematics "insists on the importance of elegance and finish in geometrical demonstration, and deem it important that great stress be laid on accuracy of statement and elegance of form. "The keeping of laboratory note-books by the pupils, and the use of such note-books as part of the test for admission to college" is advocated by the Conferences on the Sciences: The Conference on History "insists on note-books, abstracts, special reports and other written work." "If the recommendations of the nine Conferences should be carried out in grammar and high schools, there would certainly be at least one written exercise a day for every pupil,—a result which persons interested in training children to write English deem it important to accomplish."

The Report abundantly recognises power as an important element of educational value. Its recommendations, if adopted would greatly increase the disciplinary value of the so-called disciplinary subjects, Latin, Greek, and mathematics; and would give important disciplinary value to subjects which have hitherto been taught chiefly as information subjects. Without discussing the abstract question of the relative disciplinary value of different subjects, it is safe to say that the new subjects taught in the new ways which the Report approves have at least equal disciplinary value with the old subjects taught in the old ways which the Report condemns.

Interest and power however are not the only elements of educational value. A pupil may be intensely interested in certain studies, and may develop marvellous facility in special lines of work; and still be narrow and one-sided. The third element of educational value is scope. By scope is meant not merely the amount of information gathered; but the outlook and range of vision which knowledge opens to the pupil. Knowledge is not life itself, but the key to life; and the important question to ask about knowledge is not what is it in itself, but what does it let you into? In estimating the relative value of subjects fecundity and fruitfulness are to be considered. If Greek opens out new fields of delight in literature; if natural history unfolds inexhaustible sources of pleasure in the woods and fields; if history discloses boundless realms of conquest through political activity; then these subjects have an educational value out of all proportion to the

few facts about these subjects which are actually learned in school. The crowning work of education is

" To let man see  
How boundless might his soul's horizons be,  
How vast, yet of what clear transparency!  
How it were good to live there, and breathe free;  
How fair a lot to fill  
Is left to each man still!"

The educated man should find no impassable barriers either in the world of letters or the world of nature; no unintelligible realms, either in mechanical invention or political institutions; no confining limits in the laws of science or the forms of art. And while the complete conquest of the world is possible to no individual student; yet the measure of the worth of one's education is best defined in terms of approximation to this perfect intellectual freedom.

In their recommendations for the grammar schools the Committee contemplate a great and important addition to the scope of the curriculum. Instead of a nucleus of geography, grammar, and technical arithmetic, with a smattering of scrappy information about a few other subjects, the Committee would open to the pupils of the grammar schools a thorough course in English, an introduction to English literature, one foreign language, an introduction to the methods of algebra and geometry, some substantial and experimental knowledge of physical science, and an introduction to historical study. In this way they propose to lay in the grammar school a broad foundation for future study in the high school for the favored few who continue in school, and a wide basis of intelligent acquaintance with the elements of literature and science for the many who leave school at this point.

The programmes proposed for secondary schools give that range of subjects which is essential to scope, without sacrificing that consecutiveness and thoroughness which is essential to power. The unanimous declaration "that every subject which is taught at all in a secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease," is manifestly in the

interest of economy and simplification. By throwing all the pupils more closely together it will at the same time tend to give greater community of feeling between those who are preparing for college and those who are not; and thus to broaden the range of appreciation in both classes of students.

Under this head of the scope of study comes the vexed question of uniform requirements for admission to colleges. This was the particular problem which the Committee was appointed to deal with. And it is the one point in the whole report on which their position is radically unsound; and on which their recommendations are vague and indefinite.

The majority report accepts "the theory that all the subjects are to be considered equivalent in educational rank for the purpose of admission to college", and that "if a youth has had four years of strong and effective mental training, it makes no difference which subjects he has chosen from the programme."

As President Baker remarks in the minority report, this is a theory "which makes education formal, and does not consider the nature and value of the content." Stated in this extreme form the doctrine of the equivalence of studies for the purpose of admission to college is as absurd as the doctrine that in preparing to build a house it makes no difference whether you begin with the work of the stone-mason in the cellar, or with the work of the carpenter on the roof. If you put in an equal amount of labor, the house is as near completion in the one case as the other. It does not matter whether you build your house from the roof down, or from the foundation up.

Some studies are fundamental to a liberal education. To omit them is to build upon the sand. To postpone them is to build from the roof down.

Latin is fundamental to the study of language, literature, law, history, and all that concerns the expression man has made of himself in art, letters, politics, and institutions. The Romans built the highways on which civilization has marched for eighteen centuries, and it is as true of the intellectual world to-day as it was of the political world under Augustus, that all roads lead to Rome. The man who has never studied Latin finds all forms of liberal study blind and unintelligible. By a dead lift of arbitrary memory he will have to learn roots of words and forms of speech

which with the aid of a little Latin would become rationally intelligible. He will have to dig out of dictionaries the dead bones of references and allusions which a little classical learning would have clothed with life. He will be able to trace back the origin of institutions, the significance of terminology, the motives of art almost to their source; only to be baffled at last, and compelled to give up the quest.

On the side of art and literature, this same argument would compel the addition of Greek. Yet much of the discipline of the scientific study of a highly inflected language, much of the sense of historical perspective; much of the satisfaction of dealing with formative social forces at first hand can be secured through the thorough study of Latin alone. Greek is a highly desirable element of a liberal education; and indispensable for certain lines of liberal study. Latin is indispensable for all forms of liberal study that is worthy of the name. Latin is the Thermopylae, where the modern Greeks must take their stand, determined to withstand the Barbarians or perish in the attempt. As Latin is fundamental to the study of human civilization, so mathematics is fundamental to the study of natural science. Algebraic formulae and geometrical figures confront us at every turn. The ability to keep the precise identity and exact value of a single element through all the disguises and complications of elaborate and complex processes which mathematical training imparts is absolutely essential to all scientific investigation. Science without mathematics is as limp and impotent as a body without a skeleton.

Again; however much a man may know of other subjects; however fluently he may speak in foreign tongues; we do not call him an educated man unless he can use his native language with accuracy and force; and unless he has some adequate appreciation of the literary treasures which it contains. Tardily we have come to recognize that English is fundamental to American education. On these three subjects as fundamental the colleges may safely take their stand. Latin, mathematics, and English should be absolute requirements for every liberal course of study. For the man who undertakes liberal study without them will find himself constantly cramped, hampered, and confined. Where other men find windows, he will find impenetrable walls. While they walk in the light he will be enveloped in clouds and darkness. These studies

are fundamental to the enjoyment and profit of all future studies; and it is the duty of the colleges to recognise the fundamental character of these studies in their requirements for admission. In view of the extreme difficulty in making English a serious study; and in recognition of the fact that the best training in English is the intelligent study of Latin, the colleges may wisely continue to make Latin a larger element in the preparatory work, and English a smaller element than the other subjects. To give Latin a third more time than the other subjects and English a third less; making the time devoted to Latin twice that devoted to English, is as small an allowance as we can afford to give to Latin, and is as liberal an allowance as English can reasonably expect.

Assuming then 12 periods, or four hours a week for three years, as the unit of preparatory work in any subject required for admission to college, our absolute requirements stated in terms of periods are Latin 16 periods, mathematics 12 periods, English 8 periods.

This gives a total of 36 periods; or an average of 9 periods a week for each of the four years.

The number of periods which can be profitably used in a week is variously estimated at from 16 to 20. In view of the fact that both boys and girls are trained together in the high schools, and that in many cases additional studies as elocution, music, and drawing will be taken, it is not wise to make the required preparatory work exceed 15 periods per week. It is wiser to demand a moderate amount of work; which can be done calmly and thoroughly; leaving a little time and strength to spare for other interests; than to force our requirements up to the highest pitch of possible attainment with the certainty that the boys will shirk the extra effort, and the girls will break down under the excessive strain. Fifteen periods of preparatory work a week, continued for a period of four years is as much as we can wisely require. That leaves us 6 periods a week for four years, or 24 periods in all, still to be filled. That allows us to require two subjects, calling for 12 periods each. What shall those subjects be? Hitherto one of them has been Greek; and the tendency has been to introduce a modern language for the other. Here is an opportunity to apply in a moderate form the principle of the equivalence of studies. Standing alone, and stated in its extreme form this

principle is absurd and pernicious. With such a foundation of absolute requirement of fundamental subjects as we have already outlined, this principle may be profitably applied. Having required Latin, mathematics, and English to the extent of 36 out of the 60 periods, the colleges may safely and wisely accept for the remaining 24 periods any two of half a dozen carefully selected subjects. Following the suggestions of the Committee those six subjects would be Greek; French; German; physics and chemistry; natural history and geography; and history.

Such a combination of three absolute and two elective requirements, while it avoids the extreme application of the theory of the equivalence of studies, at the same time gives ample opportunity for a selection between linguistic and scientific studies, according to the tastes and preferences of the individual pupil. It is in line with the recommendation of the Committee that "A college might say,—We will accept for admission any groups of studies taken from the secondary school programme provided that the sum of the studies in each of the four years amounts to 16 or 18 or 20 periods a week,—as may be thought best,—and provided, further, that in each year at least four of the subjects presented shall have been pursued at least three periods a week, and at least three of the subjects shall have been pursued three years or more." Yet it differs from this recommendation in reducing the required periods from 16 to 20 to 15 each year; and in defining certain of these subjects as fundamental.

The accompanying table makes no provision for advanced requirements. If a college wishes to make advanced requirements; and then excuse those who pass these subjects from a corresponding amount of work in college, that is their own private affair. Uniform requirements for admission to college must consist of elementary subjects. On such a basis there is room for addition and substitution on the part of particular institutions, but the uniform basis must be simple and elementary.

The table aims to show what the colleges may reasonably require of the average high school having a course extending over four years. On this basis the college requires the school to teach only one subject, Latin, which it would not be required to teach in any course of four years which it might offer. It allows the school to select which two out of six elective subjects it will teach.

Thus it does not, as is the case at present, divert an undue proportion of the school money from the many who will not go to college to the few who will go to college. It simply requires that it shall teach whichever of these subjects it chooses, thoroughly and consecutively; and thus it increases the educational value of these subjects to all who take them, whether they are preparing for college or not.

The table is presented, not in the expectation that it will be adopted; but in the hope that it may afford a definite object of attack and discussion; which may ultimately lead to the adoption of a list more carefully constructed on these same principles. Of course the requirements here stated in periods should be stated specifically in terms of the exact nature and amount of the work required.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO COLLEGE.

Absolute Requirements.	Periods.
Latin .....	16
Mathematics .....	12
English .....	8
	—
	36

Elective Requirements (Two to be taken).

Greek.....	12
French.....	12
German.....	12
Physics and Chemistry.....	12
Natural History and Geography.....	12
History.....	12
	—
	24
	—
	60

Preparatory work—15 periods a week for 4 years.

The adoption of a list of requirements constructed on this principle would involve slight, though not difficult or expensive changes in the college course. It would be necessary to give an elementary course in college on each of the elective subjects, which should cover in one year the work done in the three years of the secondary school. All colleges have such elementary courses in modern languages, history, and science; so that an elementary course in Greek would be the only one to be added. Tufts College has recently introduced such an elementary course

in Greek for those who have not taken Greek as a preparatory subject. The superior maturity and training of the college student ought to make him able to do in one year the work for which the preparatory school takes three years or twelve periods.

Such a requirement for admission, so enforced, would broaden rather than narrow the foundation of the college course. At present to the student whose interests have been awakened and whose power has been developed chiefly through science, history, and modern languages, the door to the degree of A. B. is, in many of our institutions, absolutely closed. In Harvard, Tufts, Wellesley, and Williams, among New England colleges it is open, on more or less severe conditions of advanced work in special lines; and all the New England universities and colleges, except, I am sorry to say, the three colleges in Maine, have courses of four years leading to a degree, to which the complete classical course including Greek is not an essential condition of admission. Throughout the West the maintenance of parallel courses leading to different degrees is almost universal. The time is ripe for the general adoption of a uniform basis of requirement for admission to college on the principles outlined by the Committee of Ten. The acceptance of the general principle would leave ample room for local variations, according to the state of secondary school instruction. Some colleges might require only one of the elective requirements; and others might require three; or make advanced requirements in particular subjects.

Such a uniform standard of requirements, even if local departures from it should be considerable, would do more than anything else to bring about the desired articulation of schools and colleges; and to give us that "prevailing conformity of school programmes" which, as Principal Bancroft has said, is necessary "if we are to have a national education." In the speedy agreement upon some common basis of requirements for admission; broad and elastic in scope, yet rigid and thorough within the lines the school or pupil may select, lies the most important service which it is in the power of the colleges to render to popular education; and from such action there would come indirectly the largest benefit to themselves. In this way the colleges could stimulate and elevate the teaching of the entire secondary school course, instead of a mere fraction of it; and in return the colleges would

draw the choicest students from the whole secondary school; instead of the foreordained few whose parents had the foresight to select for them in advance one particular line of study.

Judged by the three standards of educational value, interest, power, and scope, the recommendations of the Committee on the whole stand approved. In some respects, as in the doctrine of the equivalence of studies for the purpose of admission to college, and in the attempt to introduce original research into the study of history in secondary schools, their zeal has doubtless carried them too far, and given us "university education diluted to the capacity of the infant mind." Viewed in the abstract the amount of work required seems excessive; and doubtless in practice it would be necessary to allow the course of four years to be extended to five or six in the case of the delicate or the dull. Still the increased interest and power resulting from improved methods of instruction; the possibilities of earlier introduction of substantial studies in the grammar schools, and the help which one subject gives another through closer correlation and coördination would combine to make the actual effort involved in the proposed programmes much less than at first sight it seems.

After all the only way to secure the better is to strive for the best. Ideals are more fruitful than facts. And the Committee of Ten have given us an ideal of popular education which is destined to bear increasing harvests of improvement through many years to come.

Immediately after the address, the Association repaired to another room where refreshments were served and a most enjoyable hour was spent in social intercourse. The arrangements for this social meeting had been made by a committee consisting of Dr. Moses Merrill, Mr. Byron Groce, and Mr. George W. Rollins, of the Public Latin School.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13th.

The Association reassembled soon after 9 A. M. for a business meeting, with Dr. Tetlow in the chair.

President Seelye, for the Executive Committee, named for membership in the Association eleven persons, and they were unanimously elected. Their names are as follows:

Adèle Allen, Teacher in Hillhouse High School, New Haven; Dana M. Dustan, Principal of Tabor Academy, Marion, Mass.; Margaret R. Ingols, Principal of School for Girls, Cambridge, Mass.; James Jenkins, Principal of the English High School, Worcester; Clarence E. Kelley, Principal of the High School, Haverhill; Otis B. Oakman, Teacher in Thayer Academy, South Braintree; Charles C. Ramsay, Principal of B. M. C. Durfee High School, Fall River, Mass.; Irving H. Upton, Principal of the High School, Portsmouth, N. H.; Clara R. Walker, Teacher in Hillhouse High School, New Haven; Marion P. Whitney, Teacher in Hillhouse High School, New Haven; Ella G. Willcox, Instructor in Wellesley College, Wellesley.

The Secretary, Ray Greene Huling, reported the membership, including the members just elected, to be as follows: from the colleges, 116; from the secondary schools, 132; total, 248. Of the members from the secondary schools, 56 represent high schools, and 76 private or endowed schools.

As Treasurer, the same speaker presented the following statement:

#### RECEIPTS.

Balance at last report.....	\$150 00
<b>Assessments collected:</b>	
1891-2, (2) .....	\$ 3 00
1892-3, (11) .....	16 50
1893-4, (214) .....	321 00
1894-5, (2) .....	3 00
<b>Received for reports and postage .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Total receipts .....</b>	<b>\$494 35</b>

#### PAYMENTS.

Printing .....	\$ 87 81
Postage and stationery .....	52 28
Freight and expressage.....	3 05
Stenographer, janitor, and other service.....	46 75
Expenses of Delegates and Speaker.....	66 00
<b>Total payments .....</b>	<b>\$255 89</b>
<b>Balance on hand .....</b>	<b>\$238 46</b>

The Nominating Committee, through Professor Fay, Chairman, presented a list of officers which was unanimously adopted, and the following were elected to serve for the ensuing year, 1894-5:

President, L. Clark Seelye.

Vice-Presidents, Cecil F. P. Bancroft, and Charles W. Eliot.

Secretary and Treasurer, Ray Greene Huling.

Executive Committee (with the preceding), Horace M. Willard, Elmer H. Capen, William DeWitt Hyde, Edward G. Coy, Frances E. Lord.

In accordance with the report of the same Committee, William Gallagher was chosen a member of the Committee of Conference, to serve three years.

The Committee of Conference, through its Chairman, Mr. William C. Collar, reported as follows:

The Committee to confer with the Commission of Colleges in New England submit the following report:

They met the Commission on the 20th of April, 1894, and laid before them the following propositions:—

At the meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools held at New Haven, October 13 and 14, 1893, it was voted:—"That the Committee appointed to confer with the Commission of Colleges be instructed to present to the Commission the subject of a wider range of choice in the Latin authors and works required for admission to college.

This Committee finds

1. That the Latin authors, some parts of whose works is required to be read in preparation for college, are Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, Vergil, and Ovid.

2. That this list of authors is sufficiently comprehensive to afford ample variety in reading to satisfy admission requirements.

3. That, however, the practice on the part of the colleges of designating for very long periods the same parts of the authors named above, to be read in preparation for college, is open to serious objection.

4. That, furthermore, the practice of designating equivalents, as it has been conducted hitherto, without concert and agreement on the part of the colleges, is fruitful of confusion and embarrassment in many cases, particularly in the transition of students from school to school.

5. That a very desirable degree of variety in preparatory reading in Latin can be provided for by adopting the principle of the requirements at present prevailing in the modern languages and in English, to wit: a designation in advance of works to be read for several successive years, only observing that changes should be made more slowly in the Latin list than in the others.

The preceding observations have reference to requirements for admission to college. But this Committee is convinced that the colleges could

exert a great and wholly beneficial influence through recommendations as distinguished from requirements. We urge therefore

6. That colleges admitting by certificate recommend in the department of Latin what it has been proposed that the others should prescribe.

7. That all colleges recommend to the schools the reading of some easier Latin, as the Fables of Æsop, Eutropius, Viri Romae, before attacking a classical author of no greater difficulty even than Nepos or Caesar.

8. To check the danger which may come to elementary training in Latin from a too exclusive concentration upon the aim of reading Latin at sight, this Committee recommends a modification of the mode of examining, to wit: along with the test in reading at sight a somewhat critical examination on a small portion of an author, the particular book, etc., to be designated always in advance.

WILLIAM C. COLLAR,  
WILLIAM T. PECK,  
C. E. FISH, } Committee.

April 20, 1894.

The propositions were explained, discussed, and referred by the Commission to a special committee.

On the 21st of April, your committee was invited to meet the Commission in conference with a representative of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland in reference to the requirements for admission to college in English. They accordingly assisted in that deliberation, which proved an excellent preparation for the conference held in Philadelphia May 17, 18, and 19, 1894.

The following letter from Professor W. C. Poland, Secretary of the Commission of Colleges, is presented with this report. It is interesting as showing what action has been taken by the Commission on the subject of the preceding conference.

WILLIAM C. COLLAR,  
WILLIAM T. PECK,  
CHARLES E. FISH, } Committee.

9 Lloyd Street,  
PROVIDENCE, R. I., 10 October, 1894.

**TO MESSRS. W. C. COLLAR, W. T. PECK, AND C. E. FISH, Committee:**

**DEAR SIRS:**

As the Committee appointed by the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools to confer with the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, you have a special interest in certain acts of the Commission, an account of which I now have the honor to communicate to you.

At the seventh annual meeting of the Commission, held in Boston on the 28th of April, 1893, your predecessors in the Committee to Confer presented to the Commission some statements respecting the forms of certificates in use in certain colleges. The Commission, in response to these statements, appointed a committee "to inquire whether a lack of uniformity in other subjects than Latin and Greek is caused by the existing forms of certificates for admission." That committee presented its report at the eighth annual meeting of the Commission in April, 1894. In this report they say: "That they have collected the forms of certificates used by the various colleges represented in the Commission and have carefully compared the same. In their judgment no lack of uniformity in the subjects required for admission is caused by variations in the forms of certificates. The variations do not result from a difference in the requirements for admission, but from a difference in the methods of certification."

At the eighth annual meeting of the Commission, on the 20th of April, 1894, you met the Commission in conference, and in continuation of the matter which you brought forward a year before, you presented a series of propositions on the general subject of a wider range of choice in the Latin authors and works required for admission to college. As you know, the Commission has appointed a committee "to inquire into the present condition of the requirements in Latin and in Greek." Your communication has been referred to that committee, who already have made considerable progress in their work.

At the eighth annual meeting of the Commission a conference was held with a committee from the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland on the subject of requirements for admission in English. Professor F. H. Stoddard, of the University of the City of New York, represented that committee, the other members of which were unable to be present. The Association named, desire, if it is possible, that a scheme of requirements shall be framed which shall be adopted uniformly by the colleges represented in their body, and by those represented in the Commission of Colleges in New England. The Commission, after the conference, appointed Professors C. T. Winchester of Wesleyan University, A. S. Cook of Yale University, and L. B. R. Briggs of Harvard University, a committee to meet a committee from the Association named above, to consider requirements for admission in English. Your Association subsequently appointed Mr. W. C. Collar, Head Master of the Roxbury Latin School, and Mr. John Tetlow, Head Master of the Boston Girls' High and Latin Schools, a committee for the same purpose. These committees met on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of May, 1894, in Philadelphia, and devised a scheme of requirements. This scheme the committee appointed by the Commission have presented in a report dated at Wesleyan University on the 16th of July, 1894, which [marked "A"] is appended to this letter. The Commission held a special meeting on the 29th of September, 1894, in order to hear and consider this report.

The Commission, on hearing this report, after long and careful discussion, passed the following votes:—

1. That the Commission transmit to the colleges with its general approval, the scheme of requirements for admission proposed in the foregoing report, but that it recommend the following modifications: To substitute the title "I. Reading and Practice" for "I. Reading". After the title "II. Study and Practice" to change the wording of the paragraph so as to read: "This part of the examination presupposes a more careful study of each of the works named below. The examination will be upon subject-matter, form, and structure, and will also test the candidate's ability to express his knowledge with clearness and accuracy."

2. That the Commission transmit to the colleges for their consideration that part of the report of the conference which relates to advanced examinations.

3. That Professors C. T. Winchester, A. S. Cook, and L. B. R. Briggs be appointed a committee to act with committees from the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, to prepare, in joint session, lists of books for entrance examinations in English subsequent to the year 1898, to consider such other business as may properly come before them, and to report to the Commission the conclusions reached.

A report of this action has been sent to the colleges represented in the Commission. It is to be expected that the eighth annual report of the Commission, with a full account of the matter, will be published in a few weeks.

Thanking you for your past services to the Commission through your communications, and bespeaking your co-operation in the future, with sincere esteem, I have the honor to remain,

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM CAREY POLAND,  
Secretary of the Commission.

[ A ]

Wesleyan University,  
MIDDLETON, CONN., July 16, 1894.

TO THE COMMISSION OF COLLEGES IN NEW ENGLAND ON ADMISSION EXAMINATIONS :

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned were appointed by your honorable body a committee to meet with a committee from the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland, to consider the subject of college entrance requirements in English. These two committees, together with a committee from the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, met May 17th, 18th, 19th, in Philadelphia, resolved themselves into a Conference, and after extended discussion adopted the following as the

## REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE.

### GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Conference recommends:

1. That the time allowed for the English examination for entrance to college be not less than two hours.
2. That the books prescribed be divided into two groups—one for reading, the other for more careful study.
3. That in connection with the reading and study of the required books parallel or subsidiary reading be encouraged.
4. That a considerable amount of English poetry be committed to memory in preparatory study.
5. That the essentials of English grammar, even if there is no examination in that subject, be not neglected in preparatory study.

Although the Conference believes that the correction of bad English is useful in preparatory study, it does not favor an examination in this subject as a requirement for admission to college.

### ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.

The Conference recommends that the following scheme of entrance requirements in English be adopted by the various colleges.

#### *Entrance Requirements.*

NOTE:—No candidate will be accepted in English whose work is notably defective in point of spelling, punctuation, idiom, or division into paragraphs.

I. READING.—A certain number of books will be set for reading. The candidate will be required to present evidence of a general knowledge of the subject-matter, and to answer simple questions on the lives of the authors. The form of examination will usually be the writing of a paragraph or two on each of several topics, to be chosen by the candidate from a considerable number—perhaps ten or fifteen—set before him in the examination paper. The treatment of these topics is designed to test the candidate's power of clear and accurate expression, and will call for only a general knowledge of the substance of the books. In place of a part or the whole of this test, the candidate may be allowed to present an exercise book, properly certified by his instructor, containing compositions or other written work done in connection with the reading of the books.

The books set for this part of the examination will be:

1895: SHAKESPEARE'S Twelfth Night; The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers in The Spectator; IRVING'S Sketch Book; SCOTT'S Abbot; WEBSTER'S First Bunker Hill Oration; MACAULAY'S Essay on Milton; LONGFELLOW'S Evangeline.

1896: SHAKESPEARE'S A Midsummer Night's Dream; DEFOE'S History of the Plague in London; IRVING'S Tales of a Traveler; SCOTT'S Woodstock; MACAULAY'S Essay on Milton; LONGFELLOW'S Evangeline; George ELIOT'S Silas Marner.

1897: SHAKESPEARE'S As You Like It; DEFOE'S History of the Plague in London; IRVING'S Tales of a Traveler; HAWTHORNE'S Twice Told Tales; LONGFELLOW'S Evangeline; GEORGE ELIOT'S Silas Marner.

1898: MILTON'S Paradise Lost, Books I. and II.; POPE'S Iliad, Books I. and XXII.; The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers in *The Spectator*; GOLDSMITH'S The Vicar of Wakefield; COLERIDGE'S Ancient Mariner; SOUTH-EY'S Life of Nelson; CARLYLE'S Essay on Burns; LOWELL'S Vision of Sir Launfal; HAWTHORNE'S The House of the Seven Gables.

**II. STUDY AND PRACTICE.** This part of the examination presupposes the thorough study of each of the works named below. The examination will be upon subject-matter, form, and structure.

The books set for this part of the examination will be:

1895: SHAKESPEARE'S The Merchant of Venice; MILTON'S L'Allegro, II Penseroso, Comus and Lycidas; MACAULAY'S Essay on Addison.

1896: SHAKESPEARE'S The Merchant of Venice; MILTON'S L'Allegro, II Penseroso, Comus, and Lycidas; WEBSTER'S First Bunker Hill Oration.

1897: SHAKESPEARE'S The Merchant of Venice; BURKE'S Speech on Conciliation with America; SCOTT'S Marmion; MACAULAY'S Life of Samuel Johnson.

1898: SHAKESPEARE'S Macbeth; BURKE'S Speech on Conciliation with America; DE QUINCEY'S The Flight of a Tartar Tribe; TENNYSON'S The Princess.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ADVANCED EXAMINATION.

The Conference recommends that the following scheme be offered as a suggestion or recommendation to colleges desiring to set an advanced examination in English.

#### *Advanced Examinations.*

**NOTE:—**The candidate may choose either I. or II.

I. A detailed study of a single period of English literature, and of not fewer than three authors belonging to it; as, for example, of the age of Queen Anne, with special reference to Pope, Swift, and Addison.

II. (a) OLD ENGLISH (ANGLO-SAXON): chiefly simple prose and grammar, or

(b) CHAUCER: Prologue, Knights Tale and Nonne Prestes Tale, including vocabulary, inflection, and prosody.

#### SPECIAL RECOMMENDATION.

The Conference further recommends that the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, the New England Associa-

tion of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, each appoint a committee of conference to prepare, in joint session, lists of books for entrance examinations in English subsequent to the year 1898, to consider such other business as may properly come before it, and to report the conclusions reached to the bodies named above.

FRANCIS H. STODDARD, Professor, University of the City of New York,  
N. Y., CHAIRMAN.

JOHN TETLOW, Head Master, Girls' High and Latin Schools, Boston,  
Mass.

C. T. WINCHESTER, Professor, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

ALBERT S. COOK, Professor, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

L. B. R. BRIGGS, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

WILLIAM C. COLLAR, Head Master, Latin School, Roxbury, Mass.

JAMES W. BRIGHT, Professor, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

G. R. CARPENTER, Professor, Columbia College, New York City.

J. M. HART, Professor, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

FELIX E. SCHELLING, Professor, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

ALBERT H. SMYTH, Professor, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

EDWARD L. GULICK, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

WILSON FARRAND, Associate Master, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.

ROLAND S. KEYSER, Regents' Office, Albany, N. Y.

WILLIAM H. MAXWELL, Superintendent of Instruction, Brooklyn,  
N. Y., SECRETARY.

*Philadelphia, May 19, 1894.*

After the adjournment of the Conference, your committee held a separate meeting at which they unanimously resolved to approve, as a committee, the foregoing report and to present it for consideration to the Commission.

C. T. WINCHESTER,  
A. S. COOK,  
L. B. R. BRIGGS.

The report of the Committee of Conference was accepted and placed on file.

On motion of Mr. Coy the Committee of Conference was authorized to consider itself a medium of communication between this Association and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.

Mr. Charles C. Ramsay inquired whether the suggestion in Dr. Huling's paper, to the effect that the forty-experiments course in physics did not furnish the most desirable course for high school pupils, was in accord with the experience of other teachers.

Mr. Charles W. Parmenter stated that after several years of experience in teaching the forty-experiments course, he had great hesitation in pronouncing it the best course in physics for pupils of this grade. He favored a broader course.

A SHORT RECESS WAS TAKEN.

At ten o'clock, as ordered on the preceding afternoon, the resolutions offered by Dr. Tetlow were taken up for discussion. President Seelye occupied the chair.

DR. TETLOW: I wish to say that I am very glad that these resolutions were not pressed to a vote yesterday. I do not know of any action that the Association has taken in the past that has had a more important bearing on the work for which it was established than the adoption of these resolutions is likely to have; and it is especially important that matters of this kind should be deliberately considered, that there should not be injudicious haste in the adoption of recommendations to be made to the colleges.

It was said in the discussion yesterday that the consideration of these resolutions should be postponed for a year. I should think such postponement as that exceedingly unfortunate. I feel confident that the effect of it would be to kill the resolutions. If any action is to be taken, it should be taken while interest is fresh. If there is any forging to be done, it should be done while the iron is hot.

This Association was not established to be an educational debating society. It was established to take, after due deliberation, effective measures for the improvement of secondary and higher education in New England. When one man rises and says, "Go to, let us be closely articulated!" and another man follows him with "Amen, let us co-operate to that end!" that is well, "excellent well"; but, if we drop the matter at that point, we are not realizing the object for which we formed this Association. This is the time for formulating a "scheme", and for carrying forward the scheme to completion. I earnestly protest, therefore, against the postponement of this matter for a year.

The Report of the Committee of Ten containing the four programmes referred to in the resolutions, has been before the country many months, and has been carefully studied. The abstract from it which appears on the programme for this meeting was sent out by the secretary nearly a fortnight ago, and the members of the Association have had ample time to familiarize themselves with the programmes of the Committee of Ten to which it refers. It is true, however, that there was no intimation in the programme for this meeting that the resolutions now under discussion would

be offered. Those resolutions were sprung upon the meeting at the session yesterday, and it may be thought that sufficient time has not elapsed for the mature consideration of them.

It has been suggested to me privately that it might be well for the final decision to be postponed, and for a special meeting of the Association to be called a month hence for a final vote. If that is the preference of the Association, I have not the slightest objection to make. But even if we should pass these resolutions a month hence, the colleges could not take action and announce the result of their action in less than a year from this time. Moreover, as no steps could be taken by the school authorities in advance of the action of the colleges, it is clear that no modification of secondary school courses of study consequent on such action could take place earlier than two years from this time. Again, the normal way of giving effect to modifications in courses of study, is for the new course to go into operation with the entering class; and, as the high schools have four classes corresponding to the four years required for completing the course of study, the full realization of any modification which might ultimately grow out of these resolutions would require four years more for its accomplishment. If, therefore, we should take action this year, the final results of that action would not be felt until six years from this time. This, it seems to me, is a strong reason against postponement for a year.

President Hyde told us last evening what he considered to be the essential constituents of a secondary school programme. I don't agree with President Hyde in the extravagant claims that he put forward in behalf of Latin. I don't agree with him in thinking that a course of study from which the sciences are entirely eliminated—which is what his scheme would make possible—is a satisfactory secondary school course of study. On the other hand, there is no programme among the four recommended by the Committee of Ten that does not give liberal recognition to the sciences. Moreover, all the programmes of the Committee of Ten contain mathematics and English, two subjects which President Hyde rightly regards as essential. Now I desire to make these resolutions as acceptable as possible. I don't know what authority President Hyde had for saying that only one college in New England would listen to the recommendation contained in the resolutions. I felt, when he said that, like commanding to him the prudence of Professor Emerton, who closed one of his predictions with the statement: "This is not a guarantee." Still, judging from the catalogues of the different colleges, I fear that there might be strong opposition on the part of many of the New England colleges to the formal sanction of a preparatory course of study which gave no time to Latin. I am prepared, therefore, in the interest of harmony, to modify the second of the resolutions

offered yesterday by inserting the words, "or at least of any one of these programmes that includes Latin".

The resolution in question, as modified, will read:

*Resolved*, That, as an effective means of securing such closer articulation, the satisfactory completion of any one of the four courses of study embodied in the programmes submitted on pages 46 and 47 of the Report of the Committee of Ten, or at least of any one of these programmes that includes Latin, should be accepted as an adequate preparation for corresponding courses in the colleges and scientific schools.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: If there is any objection to these resolutions, and they will be considered as the original resolutions, they are open now for discussion. I venture the suggestion as so short a time has been assigned for discussion that the speakers should be as brief as possible in discussing the question.

MR. COLLAR: *Mr. President*:—I waited to see if any one wished to discuss the resolutions before rising to express my hope that they will not be pressed to a vote this morning. We have left about eleven minutes for discussion of the resolutions, which, as Mr. Tetlow well remarked, will embody the most important action, if they be adopted, of the Association since its organization. It seems to me that that alone is sufficient evidence that if the Association took action this morning, it would be described as hasty action. I said yesterday, in asking a postponement of these resolutions, that I did not believe there were twenty persons present who had made a careful comparison and study of these programmes. It may be presumed that I should be personally interested in the Report of the Committee of Ten. I have read that Report with great interest, but I have not studied those programmes and compared them, and weighed them, so as to be ready this morning to give my unqualified approval of them; and yet that is what Mr. Tetlow's resolutions propose that we should all do. I feel certain, if a vote is taken this morning after a twelve minutes discussion, that it will be a hesitating one, and a hesitating and divided vote going to the colleges from this Association, would, in my judgment, be of little value. I wish rather to see the resolutions postponed a year than to have such hasty and ill-considered action taken.

I suggested to Mr. Tetlow the possibility of a meeting, perhaps a month from now, to be devoted exclusively to the discussion of these programmes, and I think that that may be the wisest thing for us to do. But I think it would be a great deal wiser to postpone them a year, and run the risk of some diminution of interest, than that such extremely important action should be taken by this association after such a brief deliberation.

If I had doubts before the lecture last evening about the wisdom of passing these resolutions now, those doubts are strongly confirmed by what President Hyde said last evening. Mr. Tetlow says he does not know on what authority President Hyde made that statement, but the fact is, he made it with great positiveness and assurance, and probably it substantially represents the situation. Our proposition, then, is to pass here, after a few minutes discussion, resolutions that a college president says would not at present be accepted by more than one college in New England. I think that that shows it is necessary that there should be some discussion before we take such very important action.

I agree entirely with what Mr. Tetlow has said about President Hyde's extravagant claims for Latin. My hesitation about these resolutions is not at all grounded on the fact that one of the programmes excludes Latin. I felt last evening, as I heard President Hyde, that almost precisely the same claims that he made for the study of Latin now as a necessity might have been made two hundred years ago, but that they were not all appropriate now. Those claims ignore all that has been done in the study of Latin in two hundred years. Practically his remarks amount to this: If you want to know about Roman antiquities you must grope for your knowledge in Latin texts. If you want to know Roman history you must go to the original sources. But I think you will do better to go to Smith's dictionaries for the former, and to Ihne, Mommsen, and Gibbon for the latter. If you want to understand classical allusions, there are shorter and better ways than to rummage a great body of Latin literature.

I suppose President Hyde would say: you ought to study Latin in order to get at the literature. Well, how many have got at Roman literature through Latin? Very few persons indeed; there are most excellent translations of everything in Latin; and Latin literature is open to everybody who does not know a word of Latin. Certainly all knowledge can be translated; all ideas can be translated. What then would you lose in regard to Latin literature if you should get it in the best translations instead of in the original? Something is lost. But it would be difficult for all but a few, and those superior scholars, to say what. Now, we had better clear our minds of cant. Latin is useful to be studied for many reasons, and I myself don't see how a person can have a thoroughly inner knowledge of English without the study of Latin; but let us not study Latin because there are remains of Roman roads and bridges, nor to understand classical allusions, nor for a knowledge of Roman antiquities. Let us study Latin for good reasons, but not for the reasons urged. It is not necessary to set up any extraordinary claims for Latin.

Now, Mr. President, I believe very heartily that a great step will be taken in advance, if the colleges can be induced, and the

schools can be induced, to study thoroughly these programmes and work out from them something better than any one of them. But, as I have already said, I think this Association will do a most unwise thing to take final action this morning of such a very important nature with so very little deliberation.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: I will simply say that the time has expired for the discussion. Will you extend the time or are you ready for action? (The time was by vote extended fifteen minutes.)

MR. GOODRICH: I heartily agree with Mr. Tetlow that it would be unwise to postpone the matter one year. I don't think it would be wise to have it decided at an adjourned meeting. It would be perfectly feasible for a few of the members of this Association who live in this vicinity to come together and discuss these programmes a month hence, and I think it would be well enough to discuss them at that time, but the decision thus reached would hardly represent the Association. Why couldn't these resolutions be printed and sent out to all the members of the Association and returns made to the Secretary as to the general sentiment in regard to the resolutions.

PROFESSOR START: Mr. Speaker, in my mind the resolutions have been weakened by the amendment Mr. Tetlow has made. The exception made in the case of one study in those recommendations will enable everybody with a hobby to come in and ask for an exception.

PROFESSOR POLAND: May I ask whether the discussion is on the resolutions or on the amendment?

PRESIDENT SEELYE: I understand that by general consent the amendment proposed by Mr. Tetlow is to be regarded as a part of the original resolutions of which he is the author.

(Resolutions read.)

PROFESSOR POLAND: It seems to me there is not time this morning to discuss these resolutions as they should be discussed before action is taken. It also seems to me that the objection to a meeting a month from now is well taken. I think it would not be attended fully. It is difficult for those who live at a distance to come so soon again. And further I am of the opinion that taking the vote by mail would not be satisfactory; that gives no opportunity for discussion. I believe that after all, in the long run, not much will be lost by having these resolutions before

members of this Association for a year, and then having them discussed. So far as the Commission of Colleges is concerned, I am rather of the opinion, although I should not dare to speak with authority, that we shall have considerable business at our next meeting in April; and I think that this matter will not then receive the attention it ought to receive.

MR. BRADBURY: I should like to ask whether Mr. Tetlow puts a comma before the "or" in adding his amendment. If he does not, the amendment merely adds an alternative,—that is, you may take this or that, and in voting for the resolution you vote for it as a whole—thus approving both parts. If there *is* a comma before the "or", the amendment is explanatory of the first part—the "or" being equal to *that is*. But as a matter of fact the part after the "or" (if it means *that is*,) limits the first part in such a way as to make the first part useless.

MR. JAMES B. TAYLOR: As I understand Mr. Tetlow's motion, the resolutions as amended are decidedly in the interest of harmony and avoid the danger of delay.

The amendment, therefore, may help us. If I get the sense of it, it is that this body feels entire confidence in the courses that include Latin, and the majority of us are inclined to accept all four. The resolutions, therefore, as amended, might command the votes of the minority that insist on Latin as well as of the greater number who are satisfied with any one of the four courses. The only point that would trouble me about voting at this time is the one raised by the mover of the resolutions yesterday, who, while moving and urging the resolutions, said it was his opinion that no high school yet covers any one of these four courses.

If I understood him yesterday, it is hardly to be expected that any of our high schools will provide the necessary twenty recitation periods. Yet, if, as explained, five of the twenty would not require previous preparation but might consist of experimental physics and chemistry, I do not see why any reputable high school may not in addition call for fifteen recitations a week, or three a day, that require preparation.

MR. TETLOW: In saying yesterday that the programmes of the Committee of Ten prescribe more work than the high schools can do at present, I meant merely this: these programmes assign no time to drawing and singing, subjects which the high schools will not surrender from their courses of study. Room for these subjects will have to be made within the limits of the twenty-period programmes offered by the Committee. I did not mean at all that twenty-period programmes were impracticable for the high schools.

On the contrary the Girls' Latin School has had a twenty-period programme for the last sixteen years. Moreover, the difficulty that has been suggested,—the difficulty, I mean, of bringing within the limits of a four years' high school course the amount of work covered by the programmes of the Committee of Ten, is a difficulty that will take care of itself. The natural effect of the adoption of these programmes will be to cause a beginning of certain high school subjects to be made in the grammar schools. Experiments in this direction have already been made with encouraging success in many towns. The programmes of the Committee of Ten are part and parcel of this reform. Their adoption by the high schools is the next step needed to secure for that reform a firm foothold.

MR. E. J. GOODWIN: I would like to know if the one who framed these resolutions is of the opinion that we, in adopting them, commit ourselves to the theory that anything short of the demands made by the four programmes would be an inadequate preparation for college. As a matter of fact, the present requirements for admission to college are much less comprehensive than these programmes. I have this morning compared them with our own college preparatory course, and I am ready to say that any one of them would be more difficult than the present requirements for admission to Harvard College.

Now it seems to me that, if we express the opinion that anything short of these four sample programmes is an inadequate college preparatory course, we shall vote to cut off a large number of small high schools from the very desirable privilege of sending pupils to college.

Boys and girls from the country towns are excellent material for the colleges, and nothing should be done to exclude them from the higher education.

MR. TETLOW: It seems to me that the gentleman has set up a man of straw and then knocked him down. There is nothing in the resolutions that warrants the assumption that we consider that something less than what the programmes contain would be inadequate preparation.

MR. GOODRICH: Whether there is anything in these resolutions that can properly be thus understood or not may perhaps be questioned, but they certainly have been thus understood by quite a number here present, and at all events in their present form they certainly intimate to the colleges that we are willing to see a further raising of the requirements made.

MR. TAYLOR: It seems to me that that assumption has been taken by quite a number of us. It would intimate to the colleges that we are willing that they should lift the standards.

MR. TETLOW: Those programmes clearly do not make demands in excess of the present requirements for admission to college in some directions,—notably in Greek. The interpretation put by the colleges on the contents of these programmes will be clear when the colleges come to frame examinations under them; until that time, I think, we can afford not to be apprehensive.

On motion of Professor Fay, further consideration of the resolutions offered by Dr. Tetlow was postponed to a special meeting in mid-winter to be called by the Executive Committee.\* The secretary was instructed to have printed copies of the resolutions forwarded to the members within the interval.

Mr. Edward G. Coy presented the following resolutions, which were seconded by Dr. Willard and unanimously adopted by the Association.

*Resolved*, That it is the feeling of this Association that in the death of President Shafer and Principal Waterhouse it has lost two most valued and efficient members, prominent as educators, wise in counsel, and helpful in their official position upon the Executive Committee.

*Resolved*, That as an Association we hereby express our sincere appreciation of their valuable service and our deep sense of loss in their death.

Dr. Tetlow resumed the chair.

After a brief recess, the special subject assigned for the morning was taken up. This was the question, "Shall the Recommendations of the Philadelphia Conference on Admission Requirements in English be Adopted by this Association?"

THE CHAIR: In behalf of the Committee appointed by the Executive Committee of this Association, I will relate the circumstances that led to the preparation of the Report which is before you.

---

\* This meeting will occur at Boston University on Saturday, December 29th, beginning at 9:30 A. M.

In December of last year, the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland appointed a Committee of Ten to consider the requirements for admission to college in English. That Committee met in the following February and, without taking formal action, considered favorably the following propositions:

1. That any examination set should be based on the reading of certain masterpieces of English literature, not fewer in number than those at present recommended by the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations.
2. That certain of these books should be of a kind to be read by the candidate as literature; and that others—a limited number—should be carefully studied under the immediate direction of the teacher.
3. That each of the whole number of books should be representative, as far as possible, of a period, a tendency, or a type of literature; and that the whole number of works selected for any year should represent with as few gaps as possible the course of English literature from the Elizabethan period to the present time.
4. That the candidate's proficiency in composition should be judged from his answers to the questions set, which should be so framed as to require answers of some length and to test his power of applying the principles of composition.
5. That formal grammar and exercises in the correction of bad English should in no case be more than a subordinate part of the examination.

Before further steps should be taken, it was thought that an effort should be made to secure the co-operation of the Commission of Colleges in New England. To that end correspondence was opened with Professor Poland, Secretary of the Commission; and, as the result of that correspondence, the Chairman of the Committee of the Middle States Association met the Commission at its annual meeting in April. At this meeting the Commission, after some discussion, appointed a Committee of three persons—Professor Winchester of Wesleyan University, Professor Cook of Yale University, and Professor Briggs of Harvard University, to act in co-operation with the representatives of the Middle States and Maryland at a conference to be held May 17 in Philadelphia. Subsequently, at the suggestion of President Capen, Chairman of

the New England Commission, the Executive Committee of your Association appointed Mr. Collar and myself to attend the Philadelphia Conference as representatives of this body. The report framed by the Philadelphia Conference, constituted as I have described, is the report which Mr. Collar and myself, as the committee of this Association, present to you in print this morning.

There are two or three features of this report to which, by way of introduction to the general discussion, I beg leave to call your attention:

1. The books selected for 1895, 1896, and 1897 are the same as those already fixed upon by the New England colleges.
2. The books selected for 1898 represent the course of English literature from the Elizabethan period to the present time.
3. The several sets of books are divided into two groups, one to be read by the candidate as literature, the other to be carefully studied.
4. In the case of the first group of books, provision is made for the presentation of exercise books, containing compositions or other written work done in connection with the prescribed reading, as a substitute for the whole or a part of the entrance examination on the books of this group.
5. Provision is made for an optional advanced examination in English.

In order that the report may come properly before the meeting, I will ask—it being understood that the acceptance of the report is a distinct thing from the adoption of it—as many as are in favor of accepting the report of the committee to say Aye.

(The report was accepted.)

The discussion of the report will now be opened by Professor Winchester of Wesleyan University.

**PROFESSOR WINCHESTER:** The report is in your hands, and little need be said by me in opening the discussion. I certainly hope, however, that this report, modified in such way as your wisdom may suggest, but without change in its essential features, may be adopted by this body.

I hope so, first, because there seems to be now a prospect of securing a practical uniformity of requirements in this department throughout all the colleges of the eastern and middle states. I

think there is good reason to believe that this report will be adopted by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland at their approaching meeting; and I suppose it is proper I should say here that the Commission of New England Colleges on Entrance Examinations, at a meeting held two weeks ago to-day to consider the subject, voted to submit to the colleges with its general approval all such portion of this report as refers to entrance requirements, merely suggesting some slight modifications and additions in phraseology. I may also state as an indication of the favor with which this report is likely to be received by the colleges, that the Secretary of the Commission addressed a circular letter to all professors and teachers of English in the New England colleges, requesting their personal opinion of the scheme as a whole and inviting criticism upon any of its details. Answers to this letter were received from twenty-one professors and teachers; and while they suggest criticisms upon the scheme at various points—some of which suggestions were embodied in the changes recommended by the Commission—it is significant that all but one of these professors and teachers approve the scheme as a whole and express a wish that it may be adopted. Many of their criticisms, I may mention, practically neutralise each other. For instance, several objected to the phrase "notably defective" in the introductory note, as not being stringent enough: they would drop out the "notably". On the other hand, some thought the phrase rather over stringent, and held that in the matter of spelling, especially, we ought to be indulgent, the ability to spell correctly being a gift of Providence which, if it hadn't been bestowed, couldn't be acquired. Similarly, there were two or three who objected to the giving up of the examination in bad English, while there were two or three who were specially gratified that it was thrown out. On some other minor points there was just such difference of opinion: so that the general impression left on me by these letters was that the report of the Committee had steered pretty successfully between opposing opinions, and was likely to be received with general favor by all the colleges.

But I hope this report will be accepted, further, because it seems to me the new scheme has been so changed from the old one that the objections most commonly urged against that old scheme are no longer valid. The Chair has stated what the principal changes are. In the first place, it is recommended that the examination upon specimens of bad English be dropped. One or two college professors, I find, still think it worth while to retain this: but the large majority of teachers both in the colleges and secondary schools, doubt the wisdom of such an exercise. Doubtless the student, especially in the earlier stages of his preparation for college, ought to be taught to correct his own grammatical errors, but there is grave doubt about the wisdom of making his

ability to unravel the snarl of somebody's else bad English, in the half hour of a hurried examination, a test of his fitness to enter college. There never was any definite way suggested by which a student could prepare himself for that examination; and if he failed in it—and he often did fail, even when he wrote a very creditable essay—the examiner never knew just what to do with him. Yet even now, while the Committee do not recommend any such examination as a part of the uniform requirements, I don't know that there would be anything to hinder any professor who thinks highly of it from including a brief exercise of that kind in his examination paper. It would be no hardship to the pupil, since, as I have said, in the nature of the case, he cannot make any special preparation for this part of the examination. It would be, I suppose, only another means of enabling the examiner to decide whether his candidate is "notably deficient" in grammar.

But the most important differences between this scheme and the old one are the division of the books to be read into two lists, and the change in the nature of the examinations set upon these books. Now the objection most frequently urged against the old plan was that it required the candidate to hold in memory for examination about two thousand pages of English classic literature, and to hold it well enough in mind to be able to use it readily as the basis of an examination essay upon some one of a hundred different subjects which the examiner might chance to draw from it. Now books read in this way, it was said, gave the student neither enjoyment nor profit. He regarded his reading as a task: and even if he did chance to read anything with interest or appreciation, he always felt it necessary just before coming up for examination to go over all he had read in a hasty review, which was mere cram and served to give him a disgust for all he had done.

Now I admit that I have always thought, myself, that this objection hadn't quite so much weight as some of the secondary teachers have given it; it has seemed to me possible to assign for these examination essays, topics that should demand only a general recollection of the books read, such a recollection of them as the examiner himself, who very likely hasn't read some of them for years, finds himself in possession of when he sits down to make out his paper. But I may have been wrong; I may have underrated the hardship. At all events, *that* objection can hardly be urged against the present plan. For the student will now be required to bring up for careful examination only a very small list of books, about four, and those not long; while on the longer list, he will be required only to present evidence of a "general knowledge of the subject-matter"—such a knowledge as any bright boy may be supposed to have after he has read a book with any interest or intelligence. And if even this seem too burdensome, it is suggested that the student may be allowed to prove his familiarity

with the books, as well as his power of expression, by submitting to the examiner exercise books containing compositions or other written work.

The primary object of this examination, indeed of the whole examination in English, if I mistake not, is to test the candidate's ability to *express* his knowledge with clearness and accuracy; and here I should think it must be admitted that the change in the mode of examination is a wise one. I have said that it seemed to me not so difficult as sometimes alleged to find subjects for the student's examination essay that were fairly within his recollection: but I *do* believe every examiner *has* found it very difficult to assign for this essay subjects that should be within the recollection of the student, and at the same time should have any *definiteness*. There was always a temptation to assign subjects that did not call for any definite statements of fact or knowledge, but encouraged the student to tell—not what he knew—but only what he thought he thought. Personally I was some time since convinced that an essay made up of vague, crude opinions, hap-hazard conjectures, huddled together in the haste of an hour's limit, did not afford the best kind of a test of the student's power of expression. He was always tempted to show that he could say something—it didn't so much matter what—without first considering whether he had anything to say. It seems to me the present plan is better. The student will be asked to write a short paragraph or two on each of several distinct topics, usually matters of fact or knowledge rather than of opinion. This, I think it must be admitted, affords a better test of his ability to tell what he knows clearly and precisely than the rambling, incoherent essays that the old plan invited.

The examination on the shorter list of books may well be of the same general character, but here the questions will naturally be more searching and detailed, and will presuppose a more thorough acquaintance with the books read. Yet even here, I think, the main object of the examination ought to be to test the boy's power of expression. Of two papers, one of which showed that the boy had read his books with interest and some genuine appreciation, held their main outlines in memory and was able to express what he did remember in straight-forward accurate way, while the other showed a memory crowded with all the details of his reading but little power to state anything plainly or briefly,—I should instantly prefer the former. I said that the Commission of New England Colleges, at their meeting two weeks ago, recommended two or three changes and additions in the phraseology of this report. They voted to substitute the title "I. Reading and Practice" for "I. Reading". After the title "II. Study and Practice" they voted to change the word "thorough" to "more careful", so as to read "This part of the examination presupposes a more careful

study of the works etc." It was urged that no study of such books to be properly called "thorough" could be expected of pupils in the secondary schools. Besides, the phrase "more careful study" had already been used, of this same work, in a former section of the report. But the most important recommendation of the Commission was the addition of a clause to the next sentence, so that it shall read: "The examination will be upon subject-matter, form, and structure, and will also test the candidate's ability to express his knowledge with clearness and accuracy." The Commission added this clause to make it perfectly clear that, in their opinion, this examination ought not to be regarded solely as a test of the candidate's familiarity with the books read, but quite as much as a test of his power of expression. In fact—the Secretary of the Commission will correct me, if I am mistaken—I think it was the general opinion of the Commission that this report of the Conference Committee might well have thrown, perhaps, a little more emphasis upon the power of expression as the primary aim of preparation in English.

It is with reference to the nature of the examination required on this second list of books that I apprehend there is likely to be most criticism upon this report. At all events, several college professors have already criticised the statement, "The examination will be upon subject-matter, form, and structure," as vague: it does not, they say, indicate clearly enough the nature of the preparation expected. The teachers in the secondary schools will not know how to teach these books; and if they look for guidance to the examination papers set by the various colleges, it is hardly probable there will be any uniformity among them. Now there is doubtless force in this criticism. Perhaps I am not violating the secrecy of the Conference Committee when I say that it was at first proposed to indicate by a somewhat detailed statement at this point the nature of the work expected for this examination. But it was found that there was no very close agreement among the members of the Committee themselves as to details of method in teaching these books; some would emphasize one side of the study and some another. And so, after long discussion, this phrase, "subject-matter, form, and structure", was purposely adopted, not as vague but as general and comprehensive, and allowing considerable latitude to both teachers and examiner. And I think this will be found necessary. Unless all the colleges are ready to accept the same paper, set by some committee or bureau of examinations—and we are a long way from that—there must inevitably be some difference in the character of the examination papers set by the different colleges; one college will lay more stress upon rhetorical questions, matters of structure, arrangement, etc.; another will lay more stress upon historical connections and significance; a third, upon simple literary or aesthetic

matters. But we can get on with such differences. If we can have from all the colleges entire agreement as to the books to be read, and a general agreement in a large way as to the nature of examinations, we can well put up with such differences as proceed from the individuality of the examiners and their various opinions as to the relative importance of the several elements that enter into the examination. You *must* allow each college certain limits within which it can use its own methods on examination. But, on the present plan, I don't think this divergence will be so great that a boy well fitted to pass; let us say, a Harvard paper will find himself all at sea before a Yale paper—or *vice versa*. Doubtless, too, some modifications tending to further uniformity will suggest themselves as the scheme develops in practice.

But I hope this scheme will be adopted also, and chiefly, not only because it meets the objections most frequently urged against the old one, but because it comes nearer to securing the amount and kind of preparation in English that the college professor desires. It is sometimes said—I remember it was said at the meeting of this Association last year—that nobody could find out just what the colleges want of the candidate in English. Perhaps there has been some difficulty. Well, they want, as I understand, and always have wanted, first, that the candidate should be able to tell what he knows plainly and accurately; if he can tell it in interesting or forcible fashion, so much the better. They understand perfectly that this ability cannot be acquired merely by reading English classics, never so good or never so many; that it cannot be acquired by any form of exercise that can be definitely prescribed. It is to be gained by unconscious imitation, by constant practice guided and corrected, not in the English department only but in *all* departments. The habit of slovenly translation in Latin may neutralise all the instruction an English teacher can give. But the college professors *do* believe that by reading, if possible with delight as well as with care, a considerable number of English masterpieces, which will enlarge his vocabulary and familiarize him with admirable forms of speech, the student will be *helped* to better habits of expression. They believe, furthermore, that such reading, by educating his judgment and stimulating his taste, will prepare him for that further study of English literature which ought to form a large part of any liberal education. More than this, they believe—and this is what I would emphasize—that a selection of our best literature ought to be read by young persons before they come to college, not merely as a means to further ends of any kind, but *for its own sake*. They believe that the boy who can read Homer can read Shakespeare; that if he can read Xenophon's "Story of the Ten Thousand", he can also read Southey's "Life of Nelson" or De Quincey's "Flight of a Tartar Tribe"—that a classic, in fact, may be pretty accurately defined as a book that a bright boy

reads between the ages of fifteen and twenty and never forgets. They believe, therefore, that there ought to be an earlier and a larger place found for the study of English in our secondary schools; that any scheme of requirement which does not provide such a place is defective.

Now these, as I understand, are the things the English professors in the colleges want. This new scheme of requirements is devised to meet these wants so far as now seems practicable. Its purpose is, in the main, the same as that of the old one; but it is hoped that it offers some improvement in the means by which this purpose is to be attained; and that it will so far meet the varying wishes of colleges and schools as to secure a practical uniformity of requirements in this department all over the country.

**PROFESSOR ALBERT S. COOK :** *Mr. Chairman:* It is with some diffidence that I rise to add a few remarks, as I am virtually a stranger to this body ; but, as I am a member of the Conference that framed the Report, perhaps I shall be expected to say something in its favor. I find myself in entire accord with what Professor Winchester has said concerning the nature of the Report. Perhaps the chief reason why it should be adopted is that it will tend to secure uniformity in English entrance requirements, not merely along a portion of the Atlantic seaboard, but throughout the country. I have information that leads me to believe that the essentials of this Report will be extensively adopted in the Middle West. Advance sheets were, some time last summer, submitted in confidence to a body of representative college teachers of English in the Middle West, and they thought it wise to adopt substantially what is here set down. I think this matter of uniformity cannot be too much insisted on. The teachers of a State like Massachusetts can hardly realize how important this is to their colleagues throughout the country. Hitherto the schools of New England have had, until the last year or so, but one requirement to meet ; but in certain of the Middle and Western States, there are many schools that find themselves, as it were, between two or several fires—schools that are connected, not with one college alone, but with two or three colleges—and that consequently find themselves distracted by the multiplicity of requirements in this subject. The framers of the Report had regard to the situation, the very uncomfortable situation, in which such schools are placed, a situation which renders the best and most efficient work impracticable. If but a single requirement in English could be adopted by the whole country, what an advance it would be ! The Middle and Western States feel this especially. They of course do their work, but they would do it much better if the various opinions on the subject could be harmonized.

It is of great importance to these schools, then, and in a sense to the country at large, that we should take favorable action upon the Report. But it is of scarcely less importance to ourselves in New England. At present we have two different requirements. I think I may say for Yale that we should be inclined to adopt a plan that would cancel the difference between our English requirement and that of the other New England colleges. We have no wish to be singular for the sake of singularity. The reason why we at Yale thought it desirable to require a somewhat different kind of English teaching in the preparatory schools from which our candidates are drawn, is that the mode of teaching suggested by this Report, especially under the second head, did not seem to us to be quite sufficiently regarded in the examinations already in use. Lest it should be thought that we were peculiar in this respect, absolutely peculiar, I may mention that the twofold plan advocated in this Report has been in successful operation in California for about ten years, and has been found to work well there. I speak of the twofold plan, for it will be evident that the Report embodies two somewhat different fundamental theories with reference to English teaching—that hitherto recommended by the N. E. Commission, and that embodied in the present Yale requirement—and that it gives full play to both.

There is another consideration in favor of the Report—I mean the representative character of the Conference that framed it. Both the colleges and the schools of the Middle States were represented, the former by ten men, the latter by five. The colleges of New England were represented in a twofold manner—by the Committee of the N. E. Commission, and by that of this Association—and were besides consulted directly by means of letters addressed to their instructors in English. As for the schools of New England, I can assure you that their interests were fully safeguarded by your honored President and Mr. Collar. Whenever it seemed to them that these interests were likely to be jeopardized, they were upon their feet and ready to champion the cause of the secondary schools. These facts are your security against hasty or unwise action in the framing of the Report.

Coming down to matters of detail, I should like to call your attention to one difference between the Report as printed for the Association and the form adopted by the N. E. Commission—a difference, I mean, not alluded to by Professor Winchester. The last sentence of the paragraph headed "Reading and Practice" begins with the words, "In place of a part or the whole of this test, the candidate may present," etc. The text adopted by the Commission has, "*may be allowed to present.*" This will perhaps seem like a slight change. The reason why it might be well to accept the longer form is that the shorter is liable to mislead. What is meant is not that the candidate "*may present*", in the

sense of his having a right to present, but that it is within the discretion of the college examiner to say whether he shall present an exercise book or not, and for what part of the examination the book shall be allowed to stand.

A word or two upon the General Recommendations. The first seems to me distinctly to the advantage of the secondary school teacher, as it allows time for a fair and full test, and does not confuse the candidate by requiring the work to be done with excessive haste. The second has already been spoken of. About the third and fourth I suppose there can be no doubt in the minds of any of us. The fifth provides for those who believe in the study of English grammar, including false syntax. While it does not prescribe English grammar as a subject for examination, it distinctly proclaims that the study should not be neglected.

As Professor Winchester has said, it is much in favor of the scheme that there is to be no change in the books for the next two or three years—no change, that is, from those now recommended by the N. E. Commission. The list for 1898 embodies the important principle of the representation of different periods, types, and tendencies.

As to the clause added by the Commission to the end of the paragraph under the second head, "Study and Practice," I may perhaps be allowed to express a somewhat different opinion from that entertained by Professor Winchester, and perhaps by others of my colleagues here. The emphasis laid upon expression seems to me to have been a trifle excessive. I concede, of course, that clear and accurate expression is desirable, most desirable, but perhaps we should be quite as likely to secure it if we were not so constantly insisting upon it as the be-all and end-all of our efforts in English. It seems to me that clear expression depends upon clear understanding, and that in order to clear understanding the student's thought must be directed primarily to his subject, and not to the statement of his views upon the subject. You must supply him with interesting material, and you must encourage lucid thought upon the material, otherwise the expression, though it may be technically correct, will lack interest, will be wooden and mechanical. With reference to expression Wordsworth said, "I do not know how to give my reader a more exact notion of the style in which it was my wish and intention to write, than by informing him that I have at all times endeavored to look steadily at my subject." Not at his style, it will be observed, but at his subject did Wordsworth look. Perhaps we have been too much inclined to read the recipe backward, and have unconsciously taught the student to fix his eye upon his own expression, rather than upon the subject. Perhaps we have been calling too loudly for bricks, when we should rather have devoted our energies to furnishing straw. This, at all events, is what we at Yale feared,

and this explains why we changed the emphasis in our own examination, and why I deprecate undue emphasis upon expression in this requirement.

With reference to the Advanced Examinations, I can see no harm, to say the least, in the adoption of that part of the recommendation by this body. It is purely optional with the individual colleges whether they shall adopt any such scheme, and it is purely optional with the schools whether they shall avail themselves of any opportunity offered by the colleges.

The Special Recommendation, too, is one that it seems to me expedient to adopt, both in the interests of uniformity and in that of a wise selection of the books for future years.

**MR. FOX:** I wish to raise a point as to the possible division of the examination. I should consider it was the opinion of the Committee that the examinations under both heads, the first and the second, were to take place at one time. Last spring the Yale Faculty granted a provision which I believe was a wise one, allowing the examination to be divided. I should like to ask whether that came up for discussion before the Conference, and whether we are to infer that steps were then taken in the direction of uniting the two examinations. If so, I should enter a most vigorous protest.

**PROFESSOR COOK:** If the appeal is made to me, that matter didn't come distinctly before the Conference, so far as I recall. Whatever allusion may have been made to it, I think the understanding was that this was a matter to be dealt with by the several colleges. If you ask for my personal opinion as to what would be wise, I should say a division into preliminary and final, and that the preliminary should be on the first set of books, and the final on the second.

**MR. FOX:** I want to express my great gratification to Professor Cook, and I hope his views may be the regular custom of all colleges—the preliminary taken first, and the final after.

**PROFESSOR POLAND:** *Mr. President:* I believe I was not here this morning when the letter written to the Committee of Conference was read, but I understand the action of the Commission was not communicated at that time in full. There is part of that action that has not appeared as yet in any of the remarks made before the Association this morning and that is the action relating to the advanced requirements, and also the confirmation and the approval of the special recommendations under paragraph four. (Reads from the letter sent by the Commission.)

PROFESSOR GROSVENOR: I should like to say that in the second annual report of the Commission, on the fifteenth page, you will find that the Commission have adopted the recommendations of a conference of the English professors to this effect: that it is recommended that two hours be allowed for the entire examination in English, so that that recommendation in this report does not introduce anything that is strictly new to the colleges. In order to expedite the matter I would move the adoption of the report as printed and laid in our hands.

MR. TAYLOR: Before the vote is taken with respect to adoption, I should like to ask the gentlemen in charge of the report, if it is presumed that these recommendations call for more work. More careful work is called for on a part of the nine or ten, or at most eleven, selections made by the Commission, and after ninety-eight the amount of work is still further to be increased by raising the number from six or seven to nine in the first part. The question was in my mind, whether there was to be a further increase after ninety-eight.

PROFESSOR WINCHESTER: *Mr. Chairman:* I can say in general that I think the plan would involve a slight increase in attention given to the work. It is hardly fair, however, to measure the amount of work required merely by the number of works set for ninety-eight, as it will be noticed that four or five of these works—essays or poems—are very short. The whole amount of reading for ninety-eight I think is not larger than that in the previous years. I don't think there was any intention on the part of the Committee to increase the number of books or the amount of reading. The amount of reading in both lists will be about the same as at present; but of course the books in the short list will demand somewhat more careful study than heretofore. The matter was discussed in the Commission and the Secretary will correct me if I am in the wrong.

PROFESSOR POLAND: My understanding is quite in accordance with Professor Winchester's on this point.

MR. LOWELL: I once heard an anecdote of a man who asked which of two roads led to the next town. The answer was, "Both." "Which is the better?" "Don't make no difference; take whichever you please. Go half way in either and you'll wish you'd took t'other." (Laughter.)

I don't mean to imply any criticism of the proposed change. I think, however, that when there are two ways of doing a thing, each is likely to have certain advantages over the other; but I

favor this scheme with all my heart, because instead of being exclusively one or the other method, it aims to include the advantages of both.

The criticisms that have been made on the existing method of examination, have been many and I think have been just. But the adoption of a different method in conjunction with the best features of the old seems to me to be a happy thought. There is an additional reason to me for welcoming it; and that is that it seems to throw the burden where it can best be borne—upon the college examiners rather than upon the applicants. The questions must all be framed for the examination and must be framed by experts—by men of good judgment. They must ask questions that need to be answered in a sentence or a paragraph and cannot be answered in a word. They are to ask simple questions on the lives of authors. It would never do to say, "In what year did Goldsmith die?"—that would not be one of their model questions. Now in the past the ability of experts has not been needed to set the examinations. Certainly almost anyone can write bad English, or select a few simple subjects for compositions—perhaps the titles of certain chapters in the assigned books. But now more careful preparatory questions will be demanded and I think we shall welcome them with all our hearts.

A suggestion was made by Professor Winchester that seemed to me helpful; when he referred to the third page, under the second head, the word "subject-matter for instruction," he said that opinions might differ as to what was meant. I think he gives some light that might well be inserted in a report; thus, he gave sub-headings under "subject-matter," such as "rhetorical," "literary," &c. I think this might be carried out with some advantage and would be of help to us in preparation of the *subject-matter* and in formal *construction* until a year or two has passed and some colleges have set examinations whereby he may infer what the next will be.

We have had some very pleasant theories advanced once or twice this morning, and just here I wish to quote a little incident to place beside them. The theory was twice presented yesterday by the representative of Harvard College that if a boy knew English he would be admitted if he were not very well acquainted with some of the assigned books, under the existing method of examinations. The gentleman who presented this report said that it did not seem to him a particular objection to the present method that certain particular books were set, because he had the impression that colleges were not so particular about what books boys had read, but whether what they expressed was in good English. Now for my incident:

We had a boy in our school who from his earliest years displayed a peculiar originality and facility of expression. He was

not "deficient" in his spelling for he spelt rather too much. He had *defects*, but they were of minor importance. He left our school for a year or two and then returned. During his absence he read some of the required books, and he came to me in a little trepidation for fear he might not be prepared for the examination. I, too, had a theory,—the same one advanced yesterday,—that if a boy knew English and could write forcibly he would be admitted. I told him so. I told him I didn't think he need be alarmed, since he had read the books. He went over to Harvard with high hopes last summer. The subject which he chose was: *The First Appearance of Betsy Trotwood*. Those of you who are familiar with *David Copperfield* will remember that she appears very early in the story, but doesn't make much of an impression upon David,—neither did she upon our boy. The first connection in which he remembered her was when she issued her commands to Janet to drive the donkeys off the green. So he wrote on this episode and thought he did well, but when he heard from Harvard, he found himself confronted by a condition instead of a theory. He was looking, rather rashly, for a credit. Boys don't usually get credits in English.

The fellow was so stirred up about the matter that he went to Harvard out of curiosity and asked for an explanation. They met him courteously and told him that Betsy Trotwood had made an appearance previous to the one he had described: they also told him another startling thing—that if his admission to college had depended upon his English alone, they would have forgiven him; but inasmuch as he had no condition in anything else, they thought they would condition him in English.

Well, that is a surprising way of stretching one's conscience. Think of a boy who tries to enter college with a spotless record, and then is conditioned in English, just because he has not failed in anything else.

The authorities advised him to go home and spend his vacation in reviewing the assigned books and encouraged him with the thought that perhaps he would be admitted in the fall. He went off by the shores of the loud-resounding sea, and I am afraid he prayed a bitter prayer; at any rate he did not study any English, with the exception of reading over some old compositions and essays. But one of those happened to be upon one of the subjects set for the fall examination. So he had the chronology all right this time and was admitted—WITH CREDIT.

DR. GALLAGHER: I think it was two or three years ago that one of the boys whom we sent to Cambridge took up the English paper, and while he recognized several of the subjects as having to do with certain books he had read, said he could not write anything consecutively on any one of the subjects. He stated that fact on

his paper. He said he was more familiar with another one of the books in the list and would like to write on such and such a topic, specifying his book and subject. He passed in his English. So that the case that Professor Emerton brought up yesterday for which he could not give any guarantee was an actual case. I brought it up simply to show that on the whole the colleges are going to treat us charitably in this matter. On the other hand whenever we come together, we can bring up plenty of cases where mistakes have been made. These will happen where large numbers are being examined in our larger institutions, and the thing happens in the smaller institutions too. I had a boy bring me a paper from one of the smaller colleges within two or three years and ask me if I could read a certain passage at sight. I had been teaching Greek several years, but I could not. I asked him if he didn't have any opportunity of asking about the special words. "Yes, there was an officer going up and down, but the officer said he didn't know the meaning of the words." Now I think on the whole, while such things may occur, we may rely on the colleges for a large amount of charity.

I represent a class of academies where this matter is of vital concern. Most heartily do I welcome this report. Within two years we have prepared men for four colleges and nine scientific schools (including scientific departments of colleges) so that this matter of unity has become a pretty important thing for us. I think we ought to accept whether we agree upon one particular word or not.

**MR. GALLAGHER:** (In answer to a question whether at Williston Seminary he could carry out this programme.) We have to put the English in our school wherever we can get it in. Probably I shall not be able to do one-half of the work that is expected; a great deal of the work has to be done outside; but I gladly welcome this schedule as affording us an opportunity for a definite aim.

**Miss MARY A. JORDAN:** At the Congress of Education held in Chicago at the time of the World's Fair, there was a general impression that the requirements in English had not embodied definite requirements. The criticism was repeatedly made that the ideals of training in Greek, Latin, and mathematics were much more tangible and intelligible than those in English. Some of this alleged obscurity and indefiniteness would be lessened, if the colleges generally adopted the proposed scheme of examination for advanced standing in English. The schools could then judge better of the kind of work, and its methods, for which they were preparing their students. Ambitious schools, too, could secure honorable recognition of their work and concessions of time in

the college course for their students. The only grave objection to this advanced examination seems to be the feeling on the part of some teachers that it is unwise to extend the interests of the Commission beyond the entrance requirements.

PROFESSOR POLAND: I suggest that we divide the subject into four parts. It seems to me that would facilitate our decision because there are some matters here that it would be possible to adopt without any debate.

DR. BANCROFT: I should regret very much the division of the question into four parts. This report is the outcome of years of discussion, debate, and conference, not only on the part of this Association but of associations elsewhere. It seems to me unwise to prolong this debate when we have reached a practical agreement on all the main issues. I feel strongly on this point because we have been working towards definite results for years in the various departments with very little to show for it, and here is an opportunity for us to assert ourselves and to welcome this result as the entrance of a better day. If we begin to discuss at this moment, at this late hour, whether, for example, two hours shall be required in the English examination or one, and shall debate throughout in detail this whole report, I am sure we shall not reach the desired end. I therefore hope we shall adopt the report entire by one hearty vote.

PROFESSOR EDWIN A. GROSVENOR: I would make a motion that these recommendations be adopted as a whole with the amendments already added. I deprecate division of these recommendations. I trust they will be voted on in their entirety and adopted, not by a bare majority but unanimously or at least by so overwhelming a vote as to give force to this expression of our opinion, such as a small majority cannot do.

The main arguments have been admirably set forth by the distinguished professors from Wesleyan and Yale who presented the Report and I am not indifferent to what has been so well said. But there are two additional points which I would like to make in support of my motion.

The first is that these recommendations face toward placing English in the position which it ought to hold in a college education. We have indeed our well-filled Chairs of Oratory, and Rhetoric, and English Literature, under different forms and names in our collegiate and preparatory institutions. Yet it should bring a blush of shame to our faces that (while the Frenchman from his entrance into school until he takes his degree—however high that degree may be—is constantly studying his language and not in a

desultory way but by graded and progressive steps; while the German does much the same; while the Italian considers no field of research more fruitful than his mother tongue) we sometimes put our language into an inferior and almost forgotten place. Yet our language is inferior to none in its literature, in its opportunity of mental discipline and development, in the rich results its constant, progressive study would produce. I am not however a representative of any English department. I wish that some of my colleagues who could more appropriately represent such departments were here to speak.

The second point upon which I wish to dwell is that still another idea, underlying these recommendations, demands our hearty approbation. They do not seek so much to fit the boy and girl to the schedule or curriculum as to fit the schedule or curriculum to the girl, to the boy. While I listened to that scholarly paper, presented by our secretary yesterday, it was to the spirit which ran through it all, to which my heart responded more than to the feasibility of this suggestion or the advisability of that suggestion which his paper contained. There, I said to myself, is a man who understands boys, girls, young men, young women. The paper did not deal with the girl or boy as number one or number fifty or number ninety nine, as a mere factor, but with him in his own potential individuality. So these recommendations, advocated by my motion, while insisting upon the unity of college requirement, seek a unity that adapts itself to the young man or the young woman rather than primarily adapts them to it. It does not pare down the foot, like Cinderella's sisters, to put on the slipper. It fits the slipper to the foot. The best definition of a classic I ever heard was that just given by Professor Winchester. "A classic is that which a boy from fifteen to twenty-one years old reads and never forgets." In his mind the boy was not merely adapted to the classic: the classic was adapted to the boy. There should be a unity of requirements among our colleges. I fitted for Harvard and should have always been proud of its diploma. Circumstances led me to Amherst and I hold the diploma I did receive from my Alma Mater in equal honor. But the requirements of the two were different and I was no little inconvenienced thereby. The old way, and too often the modern way, was to prepare, not for college, but for some individual college. There is no body naturally more conservative than we teachers and more naturally inclined to think our systems are right. I rejoice at the eminently progressive sentiment that seems the keynote here. I never saw in a deliberative body, discussing subjects of equal moment—and what subjects of greater moment are there than the matters we teachers consider here?—a more marked spirit of mutual helpfulness and of determination to advance. Before concluding I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Bancroft.

To sum up my two points: I support these recommendations; first, because of the prominence they give to English; second, because, while unifying college requirements, they do so by adapting those requirements to the boy, to the girl, to the young woman, the young man, as human beings rather than as mere factors.

The recommendations concerning admission requirements in English were then unanimously adopted in the following form:

I. *General Recommendations.*

The Conference recommends:

1. That the time allowed for the English examination for entrance to college be not less than two hours.
2. That the books prescribed be divided into two groups,—one for reading, the other for more careful study.
3. That in connection with the reading and study of the required books parallel or subsidiary reading be encouraged.
4. That a considerable amount of English poetry be committed to memory in preparatory study.
5. That the essentials of English grammar, even if there is no examination in that subject, be not neglected in preparatory study. Although the Conference believes that the correction of bad English is useful in preparatory study, it does not favor an examination in this subject as a requirement for admission to college.

II. *Entrance Requirements.*

The Conference recommends that the following scheme of entrance requirements in English be adopted by the various colleges.

**ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.**

NOTE:—No candidate will be accepted in English whose work is notably defective in point of spelling, punctuation, idiom, or division into paragraphs.

1. *Reading and Practice*—A certain number of books will be set for reading. The candidate will be required to present evidence of a general knowledge of the subject-matter, and to answer simple questions on the lives of the authors. The form of examination will usually be the writing of a paragraph or two on each of several topics, to be chosen by the candidate from a considerable number—perhaps ten or fifteen—set before him in the examination paper. The treatment of these topics is designed to test the candidate's power of clear and accurate expression, and will call for only a general knowledge of the substance of the books. In place of a part or the whole of this test, the candidate may be allowed to present an exercise book, properly certified by his instructor, containing compositions or other written work done in connection with the reading of the books. The books set for this part of the examination will be :

1895—Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*; *The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers* in *The Spectator*; Irving's *Sketch Book*; Scott's *Abbot*; Webster's *First Bunker Hill Oration*; Macaulay's *Essay on Milton*; Longfellow's *Evangeline*.

1896—Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*; Defoe's *History of the Plague in London*; Irving's *Tales of a Traveler*; Scott's *Woodstock*; Macaulay's *Essay on Milton*; Longfellow's *Evangeline*; George Eliot's *Silas Marner*.

1897—Shakespeare's *As You Like It*; Defoe's *History of the Plague in London*; Irving's *Tales of a Traveler*; Hawthorne's *Twice Told Tales*; Longfellow's *Evangeline*; George Eliot's *Silas Marner*.

1898—Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Books I and II; Pope's *Iliad*, Books I and XXII; *The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers* in *The Spectator*; Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*; Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*; Southey's *Life of Nelson*; Carlyle's *Essay on Burns*; Lowell's *Vision of Sir Launfal*; Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*.

2. *Study and Practice*—This part of the examination presupposes a more careful study of each of the works named below. The examination will be upon subject matter, form, and structure and will also test the candidate's ability to express his knowledge with clearness and accuracy. The books set for this part of the examination will be:

1895—Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*; Milton's *L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, Comus*, and *Lycidas*; Macaulay's *Essay on Addison*.

1896—Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*; Milton's *L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, Comus*, and *Lycidas*; Webster's *First Bunker Hill Oration*.

1897—Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*; Scott's *Marmion*; Macaulay's *Life of Samuel Johnson*.

1898—Shakespeare's *Macbeth*; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*; De Quincey's *Flight of a Tartar Tribe*; Tennyson's *The Princess*.

### III. Requirements for an Advanced Examination.

The Conference recommends that the following scheme be offered as a suggestion or recommendation to colleges desiring to set an advanced examination in English.

#### ADVANCED EXAMINATION.

NOTE—The candidate may choose either 1 or 2.

1. A detailed study of a single period of English literature, and of not fewer than three (3) authors belonging to it; as, for example, of the Age of Queen Anne, with special reference to Pope, Swift, and Addison.
2. (a) Old English (Anglo-Saxon), chiefly simple prose and grammar, or,  
(b) Chaucer: *Prologue, Knightes Tale*, and *Nonne Prestes Tale*, including vocabulary, inflection, and prosody.

**IV. Special Recommendation.**

The Conference further recommends that the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, each appoint a committee of Conference to prepare, in joint session, lists of books for entrance examinations in English, to consider such other business as may properly come before it, and to report the conclusions reached to the bodies named above.

The appointment of the committee of three from this Association called for by the "special recommendation" was referred to the Executive Committee.

**PROFESSOR COOK :** I don't wish to say anything that may lead to a protracted discussion now, but if it were the pleasure of this Association to divide the examination into two parts, the subjects under the first might be preliminary and those under the second final. It seems to me now that it would be a good opportunity for the Association to express its opinion to that effect.

**MISS MARY A. JORDAN :** It seems to me that the details of this division would better be left to the schools in consultation with the colleges. Some schools may not wish to make the division into preliminary and advanced work, but into two examinations each covering some so-called preliminary and some advanced work. Any plan ought to secure the greatest freedom and to meet the convenience of the schools. I think, therefore, that we are not prepared to announce definite recommendations in this matter.

**MR. COLLAR :** I hope the suggestion will not be withdrawn. I hope this recommendation will be made as has been suggested. The two persons who have spoken rather deprecatingly of this seem to believe that action on the part of this Association would bind the colleges. It would do nothing of the sort. It would be merely a suggestion to the colleges of what this Association thinks very desirable. There can be no serious objection to it, and it seems to me to be of great importance as the pupils in the schools would thus be left free in the last year to study the books that are to be more carefully read with serenity and enjoyment, entirely undisturbed by the feeling that after all they must review, more or less, six or eight or ten volumes that they have read in the preceding years. In my school boys would be reading for two or three years before the preliminary examination if

there should be one. I should like to ask if this is not a matter that might well be left with the Committee of Conference to bring before the College Commission. It seems to me that the discussion on the subject shows already that we could hardly come to a decision on it this morning. I would say further, in regard to the question raised by Professor Cook, if it were left to the colleges to come to a decision as to what should be prescribed for a preliminary and what for a final examination, I am persuaded that the schools would acquiesce cheerfully in the determination of the colleges.

On motion of Mr. Collar, it was then voted that the Committee of Conference be requested to bring before the Commission the advisability of recommending to the New England colleges the division of the examination in English into a preliminary and a final examination.

Mr. Coy introduced the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That the Committee to confer with the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations be requested to urge the advisability, (1) of a wider range of authors to be read for admission in Greek; (2) of giving up for the future the separate formal examination in Greek grammar; (3) of clearly distinguishing *pass* examinations and *honor* examinations,—as well in the amount as in the quality of work to be done; and (4) of dividing the sight examination so as to test the candidate's ability to read passages suited to the capacity of those who have completed their preparatory studies, as well as to encourage the habit of sight reading from the first.

On motion of Mr. Daniell, this resolution was referred to the Executive Committee with a view to its being brought before the Association for discussion at some future meeting.

On motion of Mr. Collar, a vote of thanks was given to the School Committee of Boston for the use of the Latin School building during the meeting.

The Association thereupon adjourned.

*Ray Greene Huling, Secretary*